

1 On the Evolution of Differentiated Multicellularity

2 Martin Willensdorfer

3 October 26, 2018

4 Program for Evolutionary Dynamics
5 Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology
6 Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.
7 E-mail: willensd@fas.harvard.edu

8 Keywords: differentiation, soma, specialized cells, reproductive cells, fitness,

9 Running Title: Evolution of Multicellularity

Abstract

1
2 Most conspicuous organisms are multicellular and most multicellular organ-
3 isms develop somatic cells to perform specific, non-reproductive tasks. The
4 ubiquity of this division of labor suggests that it is highly advantageous. In this
5 paper, I present a model to study the evolution of specialized cells. The model
6 allows for unicellular and multicellular organisms that may contain somatic (ter-
7 minally differentiated) cells. Cells contribute additively to a quantitative trait.
8 The fitness of the organism depends on this quantitative trait (via a benefit
9 function), the size of the organism, and the number of somatic cells. This model
10 allows one to determine when somatic cells are advantageous and to calculate
11 the optimum number (or fraction) of reproductive cells. I show that the fraction
12 of reproductive cells is always surprisingly high. If somatic cells are very small,
13 they can outnumber reproductive cells but their biomass is still less than the
14 biomass of reproductive cells. Only for non-concave benefit functions can the
15 biomass of somatic cell exceed the biomass of reproductive cells. I discuss the
16 biology of primitive multicellular organisms with respect to the model predic-
17 tions. I find good agreement and outline how this work can be used to guide
18 further quantitative studies of multicellularity.

1 Introduction

Every organism is exposed to mutations that cause variation in inherited traits. Competition between slightly different organisms leads to the proliferation of variants that increase fitness. Most adaptations will fine-tune existing systems but some adaptations lead to new features. The evolution of multicellularity was clearly such an adaptation. It opened a door to a whole new world of possibilities (Bonner, 1965; Buss, 1988; Maynard-Smith & Szathmary, 1997; Bonner, 2001; Knoll, 2003; Nowak, 2006).

In their simplest form multicellular organisms are just clusters of identical cells. Such undifferentiated multicellular organisms can evolve fairly quickly through mutations of surface proteins (Boraas *et al.*, 1998; Rainey & Travisano, 1998; Velicer & Yu, 2003). Cells in such clonal aggregates do not have to compete against each other for reproduction since they are genetically identical (Buss, 1988). This alleviation of reproductive competition has a profound effect. It allows for a division of labor. Cells can specialize on non-reproductive (somatic) tasks and peacefully die since their genes are passed on by genetically identical reproductive cells which benefited from the somatic function. This division of labor turns multicellular organisms into more than just lumps of cells. They contain cells that are different in function and appearance. Today a plethora of differentiated organisms exist, demonstrating the evolutionary success of division of labor.

Most theoretical studies of multicellularity analyze the change in level of selection and the consequences for reproductive competition (Buss, 1988; Maynard-Smith & Szathmary, 1997; Michod, 1997; Michod & Roze, 1997, 2001). In this paper I study which conditions make differentiated multicellularity desirable. When does a differentiated multicellular organism have higher fitness than an undifferentiated or unicellular organism? In the model presented here, an organism's fitness depends on a quantitative trait. The quantitative trait is determined by the number and types of cells in the multicellular organism. The mathematical model allows one to study which kind of benefits multicellularity must convey to compen-

1 sate for its disadvantages. I calculate how much (compared to a reproductive cell) a somatic
2 cell has to contribute to the quantitative trait to make division of labor advantageous and
3 determine the optimum number/fraction of somatic cells.

4 The following section describes the model in detail. In the Results, I will first consider
5 the evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity. To study the evolution of differentiated
6 multicellularity I analyze the fitness of organisms of constant size. Thereafter, I study
7 multicellularity in organisms where the size of the organism and the fraction of somatic cells
8 is governed by the same evolutionary forces. In the Discussion, I use the insights from my
9 analysis to discuss a broad spectrum of primitive multicellular organisms.

10 **2 The model**

11 In this work I use the rate of biomass production as a measure of fitness. The rate of biomass
12 production captures an organism's ability to grow and reproduce. It denotes how much
13 new biomass per unit of existing biomass an organism can generate per unit of time. For
14 organisms of equal size, production rates are equivalent to fitness (number of new organisms
15 produced per organism per unit of time). The model considers how somatic cells, body
16 size, and benefits of multicellularity affect the rate of production. I distinguish between
17 reproductive and somatic cells but allow for only one kind of somatic cell. Somatic cells are
18 different from reproductive cells in that they are terminally differentiated. Their biomass
19 does not contribute to the next generation. Reproductive cells, on the other hand, contribute
20 to the next generation. They can be asexually or sexually reproductive.

21 To derive how somatic cells affect fitness, let us first assume that multicellularity and or-
22 ganism size have no effect on the rate of production. In this case, as illustrated in Figure 1, a
23 unicellular organism has the same fitness as a four-cell organism because four unicellular or-
24 ganisms produce 16 unicellular descendants (16 cells) after two cell divisions, and one four-cell
25 organism produces four four-cell descendants (16 cells). Indeed, if size and multicellularity

1 have no effect on fitness, then all organisms that are entirely composed of reproductive cells
2 will have the same fitness. Let us use a four-cell organism to derive the cost of somatic cells.

3 The cost of somatic cells stems from their inability to contribute directly to the next
4 generation. To quantify this cost, we can compare the rate of production of a four-cell
5 organism that has two somatic cells with the rate of production of a four-cell organism
6 without somatic cells. As shown in Figure 1, the effect of somatic cells depends on their
7 size. If the somatic cells are negligibly small, then the rate of production of a differentiated
8 organism is equal to the rate of production of an undifferentiated organism (forth row in
9 Fig. 1). If somatic cells are as large as reproductive cells, then a differentiated four-cell
10 organism with two somatic cells is able to produce only two new four-cell organisms (8
11 cells) whereas the undifferentiated organism produces four new organisms (16 cells). Hence
12 the rate of production of the differentiated organism is 1/2 the rate of production of the
13 undifferentiated organism. In general, the rate of production (fitness) is reduced by the
14 fraction of biomass that does not contribute to the next generation.

In the following we will assign parameters so the biomass and number of somatic and reproductive cells to quantify this fitness reduction. I use the Greek letters α and β to denote the biomass of a reproductive and a somatic cell, respectively, in the adult organism, As we will see, it is sufficient to consider the size of a somatic cell relative to the size of a reproductive cell. Let $B = \beta/\alpha$ denote this size ratio. Let N_r and N_s denote the number of reproductive and somatic cells. An adult organism is composed of $N = N_r + N_s$ cells and has a body mass of $\alpha N_r + \beta N_s$. Of that biomass βN_s rests in somatic (sterile) cells and αN_r in reproductive cells. Hence, $\beta N_s/(\alpha N_r + \beta N_s)$ of the organism's biomass is lost in each generation and constitutes the cost of somatic cells. The fitness of an organism with somatic cells relative to the fitness of an organism without somatic cells is given by

$$1 - \beta N_s/(\alpha N_r + \beta N_s) = \alpha N_r/(\alpha N_r + \beta N_s) = N_r/(N_r + B N_s), \quad (1)$$

1 for $B = \beta/\alpha$ as defined above.

2 So far I have assumed that the rate of production is independent of the organism size
3 and that multicellularity does not convey benefits. An overwhelming amount of empirical
4 data shows that the rate of production decreases with the body mass of an organism (Peters,
5 1986). In particular the annual rate of production per average biomass scales with $W^{-\gamma}$,
6 where W denotes the average body mass of an adult organism and γ is a scaling factor. This
7 relationship holds from unicellular organisms to mammals, with body masses ranging from
8 approximately 10^{-10} to 10^3 kg. As summarized by Peters (1986, p. 134), the exponent γ
9 might range from 0.23 to 0.37. For small organisms γ is close to $1/4$, the typical allometric
10 exponent of size. I will therefore use $\gamma = 1/4$ to discuss quantitative results. From above, we
11 know that the adult body mass of an organism in this model is given by $W = \alpha N_r + \beta N_s$.
12 Hence, the rate of production decreases by the factor $(\alpha N_r + \beta N_s)^{-\gamma}$.

I model the advantages of multicellularity as a function of the number of reproductive
and somatic cells. Let $f(N_r, N_s)$ denote this benefit function. Therefore, the fitness of a
multicellular organism is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F(N_r, N_s) &= \text{cost of somatic cells} \times \text{cost of size} \times \text{benefit of multicellularity} \\ &= \frac{\alpha N_r}{\alpha N_r + \beta N_s} \times (\alpha N_r + \beta N_s)^{-\gamma} \times f(N_r, N_s) \\ &= \frac{\alpha N_r}{(\alpha N_r + \beta N_s)^{1+\gamma}} f(N_r, N_s) \\ &\propto \frac{N_r}{(N_r + B N_s)^{1+\gamma}} f(N_r, N_s), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

13 where $B = \beta/\alpha$ is the size of a somatic cell relative to the size of a reproductive cell.

14 This model confirms common sense. If multicellularity does not affect fitness, that is,
15 $f(N_r, N_s) = \text{constant}$, then a unicellular organism has a higher fitness than a multicellular
16 organism since $F(N_r, N_s) < F(N_r, 0) < F(1, 0)$ for $N_r > 1$ and $N_s > 0$. For undifferentiated
17 multicellularity the fitness of an organism is given by $N_r^{-\gamma} f(N_r, 0)$ and multicellularity is

1 only advantageous if it conveys benefits that compensate for the disadvantages caused by
2 the size increase. In other words, $f(N_r, 0)$ has to increase more steeply than $N_r^{-\gamma}$ decreases.

3 Central to my analysis of multicellularity is the function $f(N_r, N_s)$, which captures the
4 benefit of multicellularity. I will assume that somatic and reproductive cells contribute to a
5 quantitative trait, x , and that the benefit of multicellularity is a function, $f(x)$, of this trait.
6 For simplicity, I illustrate this approach by formulating predator evasion and flagellation in
7 terms of this model.

8 For predator evasion, the quantitative trait is given by the size of the organism. It
9 increases with the number of cells. Its value determines to which extent the organism is able
10 to evade predation. If the organism is big enough, the predator is unable to ingest it and the
11 benefit of multicellularity, $f(x)$, is close to 1. For small organisms predation might be severe
12 and $f(x)$ close to 0. One can expect a steep increase of $f(x)$ as the organism size surpasses
13 the maximum particle size the predator can ingest. Figure 2a shows a benefit function that
14 could be used to describe predator evasion.

15 For flagellation, the quantitative trait is given by the flagellar drive that the cells of the
16 organism provide. The more cells, the more flagellar drive, which improves the organism's
17 ability to maintain its position in a favorable environment. For this example the benefit
18 function can be expected to be concave. An initial increase in flagellar drive might be very
19 beneficial by allowing the organism to maintain its position. At some point, however, the
20 organism has enough flagellar drive to maintain its position for most of the time and a
21 further increase in flagellar drive does not yield a substantial benefit. Figure 2b shows a
22 benefit function that could be used to model benefits from flagellation.

23 As we will see, my analysis of this model does not require an exact specification of
24 the benefit function. But it is necessary to make assumptions about the contribution of
25 individual cells to the quantitative trait.

I am mainly interested in the evolution of early multicellular organisms composed of few
cells for which it is reasonable to assume (at least as an approximation) that cells contribute

additively to the quantitative trait. I use the letters a and b to denote the contribution of a reproductive and a somatic cell to the quantitative trait. In an organism with N_r reproductive and N_s somatic cells, the quantitative trait, x , is given by

$$x = aN_r + bN_s. \quad (3)$$

Hence, we have

$$f(N_r, N_s) = f(aN_r + bN_s). \quad (4)$$

1 Let $A = a/b$ denote the contribution of a reproductive cell relative to the contribution of
 2 a somatic cell. Since somatic cells are specialized cells and free of reproductive constraints,
 3 they will generally contribute more to the trait than reproductive cells ($b > a$), hence,
 4 $A = a/b \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, I consider organisms where somatic cells are usually smaller
 5 than reproductive cells ($\beta \leq \alpha$) and, hence, $B = \beta/\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

To simplify the analysis, I scale the argument for f so that $b = 1$, that is, a somatic cell contributes one unit to the quantitative trait. By using $A = a/b$ and rescaling the argument for f , we can rewrite (2) as

$$F \propto \frac{N_r}{(N_r + BN_s)^{1+\gamma}} f(AN_r + N_s). \quad (5)$$

6 Note that if the contribution of reproductive cells to the quantitative trait is insignificant
 7 (i.e., $AN_r + N_s \approx N_s$) then the benefit of multicellularity is simply a function of the number
 8 of somatic cells.

9 So far I have not made any assumptions about $f(x)$. To simplify the analysis I restrict
 10 $f(x)$ to monotone increasing and bound functions. Both constraints are reasonable. An
 11 increase of the quantitative trait should not lead to a decrease in fitness, and the fitness of
 12 an organism cannot be increased infinitely. As mentioned earlier, $f(x)$ is scaled such that
 13 $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 1$.

1 Table 1 summarizes the variables and parameters used in this model.

2 **3 Results**

3 I am interested in the kind of benefit functions, $f(x)$, that promote the evolution of multi-
4 cellularity. I am also interested in how much a somatic cell has to contribute to the quan-
5 titative trait (relative to reproductive cells) to compensate for the loss in somatic biomass.
6 I calculate the optimum fraction of reproductive cells and the optimum fraction of repro-
7 ductive biomass. This allows us to determine under which conditions undifferentiated or
8 differentiated multicellularity evolves and to infer on the composition of early differentiated
9 multicellular organisms.

10 First, I analyze conditions for the evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity. There-
11 after I study the evolution of somatic cells in organisms of constant size. I study the uncon-
12 strained model last. In the unconstrained model the size of the organism and the fraction of
13 somatic cells is governed by the benefit function $f(x)$. I show that it is possible to calculate
14 the optimum fraction of reproductive cells and that this fraction is independent of the benefit
15 function $f(x)$.

16 **3.1 Undifferentiated multicellularity**

The evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity corresponds to an evolutionary transition
from organisms composed of one (reproductive) cell to organisms composed of several iden-
tical (also reproductive) cells. Undifferentiated multicellular organisms have, per definition,
no somatic cells ($N_s = 0$). For $N_s = 0$, the fitness (2) simplifies to

$$F(N_r) \propto N_r^{-\gamma} f(N_r, 0). \quad (6)$$

1 Multicellularity ($N_r > 1$) is only advantageous if $N_r^{-\gamma} f(N_r, 0) > f(1, 0)$. In other words, the
 2 benefit function $f(N_r, 0)$ has to increase faster than $N_r^{-\gamma}$ decreases.

I employ this simple case to illustrate the method that will be used to analyze the more complex cases. I would like to know for which functions $f(x)$ multicellularity is advantageous and what the optimum number of reproductive cells is. To get a general idea of how $f(x)$ affects fitness, we can determine the functions $f(x)$ for which the fitness is constant with respect to N_r . Let $f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ denote these functions. I refer to them as isolines since they join points of equal fitness. They are analogous to the lines on topographic maps that join points of equal altitude. These isolines can be used to illustrate the fitness landscape with respect to benefit functions $f(x)$. The fitness of an undifferentiated organism is given by $F = N_r^{-\gamma} f(aN_r)$ and constant if $f(aN_r) \propto N_r^\gamma$. Substituting $x = aN_r$, we get

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto x^\gamma. \tag{7}$$

3 The gray curves in Figure 3 show these isolines. With the knowledge of these isolines
 4 it is easy to determine which functions, $f(x)$, promote the evolution of multicellularity. It
 5 is also simple to determine the optimum number of reproductive cells. An organism with
 6 N_r reproductive cells has $x = aN_r$ as value for the quantitative trait. We have an optimum
 7 $x_{\text{opt}} = aN_{r,\text{opt}}$ if $f(x) \leq f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ for the isoline with $f(x_{\text{opt}}) = f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$. In a continuous setting
 8 the optimum satisfies $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x_{\text{opt}}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$ for the isoline with $f(x_{\text{opt}}) = f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$.

9 To interpret isoline plots, it might be useful to keep the analogy with topographic maps
 10 in mind. One can think of x as the distance traveled along a particular trail, $f(x)$, in a
 11 mountainous region. The highest point, in our case the optimum, x_{opt} , is reached if the trail
 12 “brushes” the highest contour line along the trail, $f(x_{\text{opt}}) = f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$. None of the points
 13 along the trail will be above this contour line, $f(x) \leq f_{\text{iso}}(x)$.

14 Figure 3 shows two linear and one concave benefit function. The black bullets indicate
 15 the optimum for each benefit function. As one can see, a linear benefit function will always

1 promote the evolution of multicellularity and will increase $f(x)$ until it reaches a value
2 close to one. A concave benefit function reaches the optimum earlier and results in smaller
3 organisms. Undifferentiated multicellularity would not evolve if $f(x)$ increases slower than
4 the isolines. In particular, multicellularity would not evolve if $f(a) > 2^{-\gamma}$. For $\gamma = 1/4$, we
5 have $2^{-\gamma} = 0.84$ and multicellularity would not evolve if unicellular organisms are able to
6 benefit from the quantitative trait more than 84% of its full potential.

7 **3.2 Differentiated multicellularity in organisms of constant size**

8 In the previous section I have shown that undifferentiated multicellularity is advantageous
9 for many benefit functions. In the following I will analyze the evolution of somatic cells
10 (differentiated multicellularity). For simplicity, I will first analyze the evolution of somatic
11 cells in organisms of constant size.

12 From a biological perspective it is relevant to consider organisms of constant size, since
13 many benefits of undifferentiated multicellularity imply constraints on the size of the organ-
14 ism. Predator evasion, for example, is known to promote the evolution of undifferentiated
15 multicellularity (Boraas *et al.*, 1998). An organism that uses multicellularity to evade pre-
16 dation is obviously constrained with respect to size. It has to be larger than the largest
17 particle that the predator can feed on. Replacing nine large reproductive cells with nine
18 small somatic cells could decrease its size to dangerous levels.

19 For simplicity, I will first assume that somatic and reproductive cells have the same size
20 ($B = 1$) and explore the more general case of $B < 1$ thereafter.

21 **3.2.1 Somatic cells are as large as reproductive cells ($B = 1$)**

The size of an organism is given by $S = \alpha N_r + \beta N_s$. If somatic and reproductive cells have
the same size ($B = \beta/\alpha = 1$), then the size of the organism can only be held constant if the
number of cells that compose this organism is constant, that is, $N = N_r + N_s = \text{constant}$.

In this case the fitness, $F(N_r, N_s)$, depends on one variable instead of two. Using N_r as this variable we can rewrite (2) as

$$F \propto N_r f [N - (1 - A)N_r], \quad (8)$$

because the trait value of an organism with N cells is given by $x = N - (1 - A)N_r$. Hence, the quantitative trait of an organism of size N has a value of at least AN (if $N_r = N$) and at most $N - 1 + A$ (if $N_r = 1$). The fitness of an organism is constant if $f [N - (1 - A)N_r] \propto N_r^{-1}$. Expressing the number of reproductive cells, N_r , in terms of the quantitative trait, x , we get

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto (N - x)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

1 Since we rescaled $f(x)$ so that a somatic cell contributes one unit to the quantitative trait, we
 2 can interpret N in (9) as the value of the quantitative trait of an organism entirely composed
 3 of somatic cells. Hence, $N - x$ could be interpreted as the value by which the quantitative
 4 trait is reduced due to the existence of reproductive cells, i.e., the cost of reproductive cells
 5 in terms of the quantitative trait.

Let us first calculate the optimum number of reproductive cells for a linear benefit function, $f(x) = cx$. To guarantee that $0 \leq f(x) < 1$ for all organisms composed of N cells, we constrain c to $0 < c < \frac{1}{N - (1 - A)} \approx 1/N$. As mentioned above, the optimum, x_{opt} , satisfies $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x_{\text{opt}}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$ for the isoline with $f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}}) = f(x_{\text{opt}})$. Hence, we have to solve the two equations $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x_{\text{opt}}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$ and $f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}}) = f(x_{\text{opt}})$ for x_{opt} and the (irrelevant) constant k in $f_{\text{iso}}(x) = k(N - x)^{-1}$. Solving these equations for the benefit function $f(x) = cx$, we get $x_{\text{opt}} = N/2$ which corresponds to and optimum number of reproductive cells of

$$N_{r,\text{opt}} = \frac{N}{2(1 - A)}. \quad (10)$$

6 As we can see, the optimum value for the quantitative trait is independent of A . The

1 parameter A does, however, determine how many somatic cells are necessary to reach the
2 optimum value x_{opt} for the quantitative trait, and hence $N_{r,\text{opt}}$. Remarkably, the optimum
3 number of reproductive cells is independent of the slope, c , of the linear benefit function.
4 We only constrained the slope so that the linear function does not exceed one ($f(x) < 1$).
5 Equation (10) also shows that the number of reproductive cells is usually greater than $N/2$
6 and only equal to $N/2$ if reproductive cells do not contribute to the quantitative trait ($A = 0$).

7 If the optimum number of reproductive cells, $N_{r,\text{opt}}$, is less than N , then somatic cells are
8 advantageous and differentiated multicellularity is likely to evolve. From (10) we see that
9 this is only the case if $A < 1/2$ which means that somatic cells have to contribute twice as
10 much as reproductive cells to the quantitative trait to justify their existence.

11 We can summarize our results for organisms of constant size, uniform cell sizes, and
12 linear benefit functions: (a) such organisms contain many reproductive cells, and (b) somatic
13 cells in such organisms have to contribute substantially more to the quantitative trait than
14 reproductive cells. In the following I analyze isoline plots to illustrate that this result holds
15 for many nonlinear benefit functions.

16 Figure 4a shows four benefit functions and isolines $f_{\text{iso}}(x) = (N - x)^{-1}$ for $N = 32$.
17 The solid line represents a linear benefit function that satisfies the requirements from above
18 ($f(x) < 1$). It is evident that the isolines and the benefit function have the same slope
19 at $x_{\text{opt}} = N/2 = 16$. The Figure illustrates that x_{opt} does not depend on A (the relative
20 contribution of a reproductive cell to the quantitative trait). Even though x_{opt} is always
21 with respect to A , this parameter determines how many somatic cells, if any, are required
22 to reach this x_{opt} . The top axis shows how x corresponds to N_r for four different values of
23 A . As A increases to one, the range of possible values for x , AN to $N - (1 - A)$, shrinks (to
24 the right). This is no surprise. If the contribution of reproductive and somatic cells to the
25 quantitative trait are about the same, then the total value of the quantitative trait changes
26 little if one substitutes a reproductive cell for a somatic cell. One can see that if A is larger
27 than $1/2$, then the quantitative trait of an undifferentiated organism already exceeds the

1 optimum value of $x_{\text{opt}} = N/2 < AN$ for a linear benefit function. There is no need for the
2 organism to evolve somatic cells.

3 Figure 4a contains two concave benefit functions (dashed and dash-dotted curves). It is
4 easy to localize x_{opt} for these functions and obvious that their x_{opt} is smaller than the x_{opt}
5 for the linear benefit function. For a concave benefit function, organisms need less somatic
6 cells to optimize fitness and the functional demand on somatic cells to justify their existence
7 increases (A has to be even smaller, see upper axis in Fig. 4a). Hence, the results from above,
8 that organisms have few somatic cells and that somatic cells have to contribute substantially
9 more to the quantitative trait does also hold for concave functions.

10 Examining the isolines in Figure 4a we see that only a convex function can lead to
11 organisms with many somatic cells and few reproductive cells. A convex function would
12 describe a situation in which the organism has to obtain a minimum threshold value to
13 benefit from the quantitative trait. In such a situation the functional demand on somatic
14 cells is relaxed and organisms might require many somatic cells to optimize fitness.

15 **3.2.2 Somatic cells that are smaller than reproductive cells ($B < 1$)**

16 If somatic cells are smaller than reproductive cells, then the total number of cells, N , can
17 change even if the size of the organism remains constant. If, for example, reproductive cells
18 are twice as large as somatic cells ($B = 1/2$), then one reproductive cell can be replaced by
19 two somatic cells, which increases the total number of cells by one but keeps the organism
20 size constant.

If somatic cells are half the size of reproductive cells, we can simply apply the results
from above by changing the parameter A . Since contributions are additive in my model,
somatic cells of size β that contribute b to the quantitative trait are equivalent to somatic
cells of size $\beta/2$ that contribute $b/2$ to the quantitative trait. In other words, if somatic cells
that are as large as reproductive cells are beneficial, then somatic cells that are half as large
and contribute half as much to the trait have to be beneficial as well. Hence, to get result

for $B < 1$, we only have to consider the results from above and replace A with AB . For example, for a linear benefit function the optimum number of reproductive cells is given by

$$N_{r,\text{opt}} = \frac{N}{2(1 - AB)} \quad (11)$$

1 and somatic cells are advantageous if $AB < 1/2$. For concave benefit functions, we can
2 conclude that more than half of the biomass of the organism will rest in reproductive cells
3 and that somatic cells need to satisfy $AB < 1/2$ to justify their existence. Appendix A
4 contains a more technical and detailed analysis of the case $B < 1$. For completeness, I
5 analyze a model in which the number of cells is held constant (as opposed to the size of the
6 organism) in Appendix B.

7 **3.3 The complete (unconstrained) model**

8 Let us now study the unconstrained model. By not restricting the number of cells or the
9 size of the organism, I assume that its size and the optimum fraction of reproductive cells
10 are governed by one evolutionary force. In this case the quantitative trait, x , can no longer
11 be expressed as a function of N_r . It depends on N_r and N_s . This makes the calculation and
12 visualization of isolines unwieldy. Instead, we can actually calculate the maximum of the
13 fitness function. In the following we will realize that if the size and the composition of the
14 organism can change freely, then the optimum fraction of reproductive cells is independent
15 of $f(x)$ and can be calculated.

Using $N_s = N - N_r$ and $q = N_r/N$ we have

$$x = N(1 - (1 - A)q) \quad (12)$$

and can rewrite (2) as

$$F \propto \frac{q}{N^\gamma [(1-B)q + B]^{1+\gamma}} f[N(1 - (1-A)q)]. \quad (13)$$

In the following I assume that there is at least one reproductive cell ($q > 0$) and that somatic cells contribute more to the quantitative trait than reproductive cells ($A < 1$). Further, I assume that $f(x)$ is differentiable and monotone increasing ($\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} > 0$). We can calculate

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial N} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial N} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \cdot [1 - (1-A)q] \quad (14)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial q} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \cdot N(1-A). \quad (15)$$

Since none of the factors in (14) and (15) equal zero, we can express $\frac{\partial f}{\partial q}$ in terms of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial N}$,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial N} \frac{N(1-A)}{1 - (1-A)q}. \quad (16)$$

Applying the product rule of differentiation to (13) we get

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial N} \propto -\frac{\gamma f}{N} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial N}. \quad (17)$$

If the number of cells, N , is optimal, then $\frac{\partial F}{\partial N} = 0$ and hence $\frac{\partial f}{\partial N} = \frac{\gamma f}{N}$ which can be substituted into (16) to give

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} = -\frac{(1-A)\gamma}{1 - (1-A)q} f. \quad (18)$$

Differentiating (13) with respect to q results in

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \propto [(1-B)q + B]f - (1+\gamma)q(1-B)f + q[(1-B)q + B] \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \quad (19)$$

Using (18) we can substitute $\frac{\partial f}{\partial q}$ in (19) and get

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \propto \left[B + \gamma q(1 - B) - \frac{q((1 - B)q + B)(1 - A)\gamma}{1 - (1 - A)q} \right] f. \quad (20)$$

The fraction of reproductive cells is optimal if $\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} = 0$. Since $f > 0$, the optimum fraction of reproductive cells can be determined by calculating for which q the factor in (20) equals zero. Multiplying this equation by $1 - (1 - A)q$ shows that terms quadratic in q , i.e., $(1 - A)(1 - B)q^2$ cancel. Hence, this equation is linear in q and can be solved to give

$$q_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\gamma^{-1}B}{1 - [1 - (1 + \gamma^{-1})(1 - A)]B}. \quad (21)$$

1 Thus, we are able to calculate the optimum fraction of reproductive cells, q_{opt} . Remark-
 2 ably, q_{opt} is independent of the benefit function $f(x)$. The benefit function will, however,
 3 determine the size of the organism.

4 Figure 5 shows an implicit plot of q_{opt} as a function of the parameters A and B . The
 5 curve for $q_{\text{opt}} = 1$ gives the threshold for parameter values that favor the evolution of
 6 differentiated multicellularity. This curve is given by $AB = \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$ ($= 1/5$ for $\gamma = 1/4$). In
 7 particular, if somatic cells are as large as reproductive cells ($B = 1$), then they are only
 8 beneficial if $A < \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$. For $\gamma = 1/4$, somatic cells have to contribute five times as much to the
 9 quantitative trait than the reproductive cell. Similarly, if somatic cells contribute as much
 10 to the quantitative trait as reproductive cells ($A = 1$), then, to be advantageous, their size
 11 has to be a fraction of the size of reproductive cells. In particular, this fraction has to be
 12 less than $(1 + \gamma)/\gamma$.

13 Figure 5 shows that for small somatic cells (small B), the ability of reproductive cells to
 14 contribute to the quantitative trait (A) has little effect on q_{opt} . For small B , the denominator
 15 in (21) is approximately 1 and $q_{\text{opt}} \approx \gamma^{-1}B$. From (13) we also see that A appears in the
 16 equation for F only in the term $1 - (1 - A)q$. If q is small (because of small B), then

1 $1 - (1 - A)q \approx 1$ and A has little effect on the fitness of the organism.

2 That the effect of A (the ability of reproductive cells to contribute to the quantitative
3 trait) on F and $q_{r,\text{opt}}$ depends on B (the size of somatic cells) is an important result for
4 our understanding of the evolution of somatic cells. Many reproductive cells have to grow
5 to a minimum size before they can initiate cell division. Newly evolved somatic cells are
6 presumably as large as reproductive cells but are instantaneously relieved of reproductive
7 size constraints. The minimum size at which a somatic cell can still function might be much
8 smaller than the minimum size of a reproductive cell. Organisms will have the tendency to
9 evolve somatic cells that are as small as possible (decrease B). Equation 21 shows that a
10 decrease of B increases the optimum number of somatic cells (decreases $q_{r,\text{opt}}$). This will
11 further increase the selective pressure to reduce the size of somatic cells because the organism
12 has now more somatic cells that should not be unnecessarily large. This feedback loop might
13 continue until there are many, small somatic cells. At this point (small B) the contribution
14 of reproductive cells to the quantitative trait has no major effect on fitness (see Fig. 8b).
15 Hence, reproductive cells can cease to contribute to the somatic function (the quantitative
16 trait in my model) with little effect on fitness. They are free to dedicate their existence
17 fully to reproductive duties. Such an evolutionary feedback loop promotes the evolution of
18 organisms with a strict division of labor between many, small somatic cells and few, large
19 reproductive cells.

20 It is important to emphasize that we treated q and N as continuous variables. Especially
21 for small multicellular organisms they are, however, discrete. For example, a bicellular
22 organism can have a q of $1/2$ or 1 . From Figure 5 and (21) we know that somatic cells in
23 such a bicellular organism are (even for $A = 0$) only advantageous if they are much smaller
24 than reproductive cells ($B < \gamma$). Also, for $B = 1$ the optimum fraction of reproductive cells
25 is always larger than $1/(1 + \gamma)$ ($= 4/5$ for $\gamma = 1/4$). Hence, evolutionary transitions to
26 differentiated multicellularity with somatic cells that are as large as reproductive cells can
27 only happen in organisms that are composed of at least six cells.

4 Discussion

I have presented a model for the evolution of undifferentiated and differentiated multicellular organisms. In my model three factors determine an organism's fitness: (a) its size (or biomass), (b) its investment in somatic (terminally differentiated) cells, and (c) a quantitative trait that is mainly determined by the number and kind of cells that the organism is composed of. The quantitative trait, x , affects the fitness of the organism via a benefit function, $f(x)$ (see Fig. 1). For simplicity I assume that the cells of a multicellular organism contribute additively to the quantitative trait. Since somatic cells are specialized and terminally differentiated, they can contribute more to the quantitative trait than reproductive cells.

I analyze under which conditions (benefit function, contribution to the quantitative trait, size of somatic cells, etc.) the evolution of undifferentiated and differentiated organisms is favored, and calculate the optimum fraction of somatic cells. My analysis shows that undifferentiated multicellularity is favored by many benefit functions. The evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity is, however, unlikely if the unicellular organism is already able to receive large benefits from the quantitative trait. In particular, multicellularity will not evolve if the unicellular organism benefits from the quantitative trait more than 84% ($= 2^{-\gamma}$ for $\gamma = 1/4$) of its full potential.

My model suggests that primitive differentiated organisms will generally have a small fraction of somatic biomass. If somatic cells are as large as reproductive cells and the benefit function linear or concave, then the fraction of somatic cells is always less than or equal to $1/2$. If somatic cells are smaller than reproductive cells, they might occur in large numbers, but their biomass will still be at most $1/2$ of the total biomass. Somatic cells compose more than $1/2$ of the organism only if the benefit function is convex.

In the following I discuss the biology of primitive multicellular organisms. First I discuss undifferentiated, then differentiated organism. I use experimental data from volvocine algae

1 to demonstrate how experimental observations can be compared with model predictions from
2 this work. At the end I point out the limitations of my model.

3 Most benefits of undifferentiated multicellularity relate to an organism's ability to evade
4 predators or its ability to secure a favorable position in the environment. Predator evasion is
5 commonly recognized as a driving force for the evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity
6 (Buss, 1988; King, 2004). Boraas *et al.* (1998) showed that unicellular algae can evolve mul-
7 ticellularity within few generations after exposure to a phagotrophic predator. Phagotrophic
8 and many other predators face an upper size limit for the particles they can ingest. A simple
9 "sticking together" of cells provides protection by exceeding these size limits. In this case
10 the quantitative trait is the size of the organism. If it exceeds a certain value, the organism
11 benefits substantially from it (see Fig. 2a).

12 Multicellularity is also known to improve an organism's ability to obtain a favorable po-
13 sition in the environment. In particular, the flagellation constraint dilemma is believed to
14 play an important role in the evolution of multicellularity (Margulis, 1981). Many eukaryotic
15 cells face the dilemma that they are unable to maintain flagellation during cell division and,
16 hence, lose motility (Bonner, 1965; Margulis, 1981; Buss, 1988; Koufopanou, 1994; Kirk,
17 1997). In an undifferentiated multicellular organism, motility can be maintained. Multicel-
18 lularity can also increase the speed of an organism. Many cells can provide more drive than
19 a single one (Sommer & Gliwicz, 1986). For this example, the quantitative trait, flagellar
20 drive, determines the organism's ability to reach a favorable position in the environment
21 which constitutes a benefit (see Fig. 2b).

22 Multicellularity can also improve an organism's ability to float. Many algae lack flag-
23 ella. They regulate buoyancy through the production of carbohydrate ballast and/or gas
24 inclusions (Graham & Wilcox, 1999). Filamentous growth in combination with the secre-
25 tion of extracellular polymeric substances allows the formation of mats that provide a sta-
26 ble structure which can be used to regulate buoyancy by trapping bubbles (Phillips, 1958;
27 Graham & Wilcox, 1999). In this case the quantitative trait might be given by the tightness

1 of the mat. Tight mats allow to trap many bubbles and allow the cells in that mat to stay
2 close to the surface water where they receive more light.

3 Let us now consider differentiated multicellularity. My analysis predicts that primitive
4 differentiated multicellular organisms will generally have many reproductive cells. More
5 precisely, in most cases I would expect more than 1/2 of an organism's biomass to rest in
6 reproductive cells. In the following I discuss algae and slime molds, two groups of organisms
7 for which quantitative data exist.

8 Volvocine algae are an excellent group of organisms to study differentiated multicellu-
9 larity. Their multicellular complexity ranges from undifferentiated to highly differentiated
10 organisms (Kirk, 1997). The most primitive differentiated forms have somatic cells that
11 maintain flagellation during cell division of reproductive cells. The flagellar beating is also
12 important to provide a constant nutrient supply. It stirs the medium and prevents a nu-
13 trient depletion of the organism's boundary layers which would occur due to the nutrient
14 uptake by the organism itself (Solari *et al.*, 2006). According to the source-and-sink hypoth-
15 esis (Bell, 1985) somatic cells can also increase the uptake rate of nutrients, but experiments
16 by Solari *et al.* (2006) suggest that the stirring of the medium plays a more important role
17 in nutrient supply.

18 The smallest differentiated colonies in volvocine algae have 32 cells and 4, 8, or 16 are
19 somatic (Goldstein, 1967; Bonner, 2003b). This is in nice agreement with the model predic-
20 tion. Allometric data about soma and germ in volvocine algae shows that there is more germ
21 tissue than somatic tissue in all species (Koufopanou, 1994, Fig. 7). Furthermore, we can
22 use the data collected by Koufopanou (1994) to calculate q and B . In Figure 6, I compare
23 this data with the model predictions (21). The good agreement between the model and the
24 data suggests that the size and fraction of somatic cells in volvocine algae are governed by
25 the same benefit function.

26 To compare the model predictions with the experimental data, I assumed that reproduc-
27 tive cells do not contribute to the quantitative trait ($A = 0$). In this case the benefit of

1 multicellularity is modeled as a (largely arbitrary) function of the number of somatic cells.
2 To calculate the optimum fraction of somatic cells, it was not necessary to specify this func-
3 tion. My model is in this case surprisingly general and should be applicable to a wide range
4 of primitive differentiated multicellular organisms.

5 Figure 6 suggests that the allometric exponent for volvocine algae, $1/5$, is smaller than
6 the typical allometric exponent of $1/4$. It should be possible to determine experimentally
7 the allometric exponent of volvocine algae and compare my prediction with experimental
8 observations. From experiments similar to the ones conducted by Solari *et al.* (2006), one
9 could also learn something about the shape of the benefit function by manipulating the
10 number of (functional) somatic cells.

11 Another organism group that is commonly used to study primitive differentiated multicol-
12 larity is the slime molds. Slime molds such as *Dictyostelium discoideum* feed as individual
13 cells until food becomes scarce, at which point they form a multicellular mass that migrates
14 to a suitable spot and differentiates into a fruiting body. The somatic stalk of the fruiting
15 body lifts the spores above the ground to facilitate more efficient dispersal (Bonner, 1967,
16 2003a). In this case, the quantitative trait that conveys the benefit of multicellularity is
17 the height of the stalk. The higher the stalk the more efficient is the dispersal. According
18 to my model, we would expect the biomass of the stalk to be less than 50% of the total
19 biomass of the fruiting body. Farnsworth (1975) measured the percentage (dry weight) of
20 stalk as a function of the temperature during culmination. This percentage changes from
21 about 20% at 18°C to 13% at 27°C. Hence, most of the fruiting body is indeed composed
22 of reproductive cells. The data suggest that somatic cells are slightly more advantageous
23 at lower temperatures since the fraction of somatic cells increases. Similarly, in *Myxococcus*
24 *xanthus*, a fruiting body forming bacterium, more than 61% of the cells in a fruiting body
25 are spores (O'Connor & Zusman, 1991, Table 2).

26 It would be interesting to collect data about soma and germ in slime molds that is
27 analogous to the data collected for volvocine algae. A comparison of such data with the

1 presented model would be of particular interest since the quantitative trait is most likely
2 the size of the stalk. This trait is easy to measure and would allow conclusions about the
3 benefit function. The model presented in this paper should guide the researcher in their
4 data collection and presentation. For example, Koufopanou (1994) reported the average
5 and standard deviation of the number and size of somatic and reproductive cells. In the
6 light of my analysis it seems to be of greater biological importance to report the average
7 and standard deviation of the fraction of reproductive cells, q , and the size of somatic cells
8 relative to reproductive cells, B .

9 For most conspicuous organism such as plants and animals the number and biomass of
10 somatic cells vastly outnumbered that of reproductive cells. Notably, all of these organisms
11 are much more complex than the primitive multicellular organisms that are the focus of
12 this study. They contain many somatic cell types that form organs and interact with each
13 other in complex ways. It is important to keep in mind the kind of organisms that the
14 model is able to describe. I make two key assumptions: (a) The benefit of multicellularity
15 can be modeled as a function of a quantitative trait. In particular, for a given value of the
16 quantitative trait, the benefit does not depend on the number of reproductive cells, and (b)
17 that cells contribute additively to that trait. If one of these two assumptions is not satisfied,
18 the results can be quite different.

19 In Appendix C I analyze a model in which the fitness of an organism depends on how
20 much of a limiting resource (e.g., Nitrate) each reproductive cell obtains. This resource,
21 after it has been acquired by the (maybe multicellular) organism, has to be divided between
22 reproductive cells. This is in disagreement with assumption (a) since the benefit depends
23 on the number of reproductive cells (the less reproductive cells, the more nutrients each
24 reproductive cell receives). As shown in Appendix C, such a situation does not favor the
25 evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity. Differentiated organisms will tend to be small
26 and are mostly composed of somatic cells.

27 One might also wonder how my model can be applied to organisms for which the distinc-

1 tion between somatic and reproductive cells is not so clear cut. For primitive differentiated
2 multicellular organisms, “somatic” cells can be characterized by a delayed cell division or a
3 reduced probability of reproduction, rather than no cell division or no reproduction at all. It
4 is straight forward to incorporate this developmental plasticity into my model by modifying
5 the term that captures the cost of somatic cells. This cost is given by the biomass that is
6 lost due to the existence of somatic cells (or more generally the resources that are lost). For
7 terminally differentiated cells this is just given by the biomass of the somatic cells but can
8 be modified to reflect any developmental plasticity. If, for example, “somatic” cells have
9 approximately a 50% chance of reproduction, then the average evolutionary cost of somatic
10 cells is given by 50% of the somatic biomass.

11 In this work I mathematically described the costs and benefits of differentiated and
12 undifferentiated multicellularity. I showed that multicellularity can evolve readily if cells of a
13 multicellular organism contribute additively to a quantitative trait that benefits the organism
14 in a manner that is independent of the number of reproductive cells. Multicellularity is
15 especially beneficial if a single-cell organism alone cannot benefit from the quantitative trait
16 substantially. Only if the single-cell organism is able to exploit the quantitative trait to 84%
17 ($= 2^{-\gamma}$ for $\gamma = 1/4$) of the quantitative traits full potential will multicellularity not evolve.
18 I showed that evolutionary forces that are based on such quantitative traits will generally
19 evolve multicellular organism with few somatic cells even if somatic cells contribute much
20 more to the quantitative trait than reproductive cells.

21 In particular, for the complete model (organism size and fraction of somatic cells is
22 determined by the benefit of multicellularity) and for somatic cells that are as large as
23 reproductive cells, the optimum fraction of somatic cells is always less than $\gamma/(1 + \gamma) =$
24 $1/5$. As a consequence, under such conditions multicellular organisms can only benefit from
25 somatic cells if they are composed of at least five cells. Somatic cells can be numerous if
26 they are very small compared to reproductive cells but their biomass will still be less than
27 that of the reproductive cells. In the presence of many, small somatic cells, the contribution

1 of reproductive cells to the quantitative trait has little effect on the fitness of the organism.
2 This allows reproductive cells to specialize on the reproductive function and paves the way
3 for a strict division of labor between reproductive and somatic cells.

4 **Acknowledgments:** I thank Andrew Knoll and David Hewitt for their biological perspec-
5 tive. I am grateful to Reinhard Bürger and Martin Nowak for comments on the manuscript.
6 I was supported by a Merck-Wiley fellowship. Support from the NSF/NIH joint program in
7 mathematical biology (NIH grant r01gm078986) is gratefully acknowledged. The Program
8 for Evolutionary Dynamics at Harvard University is sponsored by J. Epstein.

1 Appendix A: Optimum number of reproductive cells in 2 organisms of constant size with small somatic cells.

3 In this section I derive the results for organisms of constant size S and somatic cell that are
4 smaller than reproductive cells ($B < 1$). The unit for S is chosen so that an undifferentiated
5 organism is composed of S reproductive cells. The quantitative trait of such an undifferen-
6 tiated organism totals AS . A differentiated organism of constant size with one reproductive
7 cell has $(S - 1)/B$ somatic cells and its quantitative trait equals $(S - 1)/B + A$. Notably, an
8 organism's quantitative trait can range from AS to $(S - 1)/B + A$ and depends on A and
9 B .

For constant size the fitness (5) is given by

$$F \propto N_r f(AN_r + N_s) \quad (22)$$

$$= N_r f[S/B - (1/B - A)N_r], \quad (23)$$

where we used $N_s = (S - N_r)/B$. Isolines are given by

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto (S/B - x)^{-1} \quad (24)$$

10 and are independent of A . The term S/B can be interpreted as value of the quantitative
11 trait that an organism entirely composed of somatic cells would have.

For a linear benefit function $f(x) = cx$ we can calculate the optimum as $x_{\text{opt}} = S/(2B)$
which corresponds to

$$N_{r,\text{opt}} = \frac{S}{2(1 - AB)}. \quad (25)$$

12 Reproductive cells will constitute $1/[2(1 - AB)] > 1/2$ of the biomass of the organism. As
13 for $B = 1$, most of the organism's biomass will be reproductive cells. Somatic cells are only
14 beneficial if $AB < 1/2$.

1 Figure 7 shows the isoline landscape and three benefit functions. Figure 7b illustrates
 2 how the isolines depend on the parameter A and B . Figure 7a shows how the correspondence
 3 between x and N_r depends on A and B . For example, an increase of A would move the upper
 4 left end of the line that maps x on N_r to the right and steepen its slope. Increasing B would
 5 move the lower right point of this line to the left and also steepen the slope. It would also
 6 change the isolines which approach S/B asymptotically. As for constant N most benefit
 7 functions and parameter combinations will lead to a fairly large number of reproductive cells
 8 or a large fraction of reproductive biomass. Only for convex benefit functions would $N_{r,\text{opt}}$
 9 be small.

10 **Appendix B: Optimum number of reproductive cells in** 11 **organisms with a constant number of cells.**

In this section I analyze the evolution of small somatic cells ($B < 1$) in organisms that are
 composed of a constant number of cells ($N = \text{constant}$). The fitness (5) is given by

$$F \propto \frac{N_r}{[N_r + B(N - N_r)]^{1+\gamma}} f [N - (1 - A)N_r], \quad (26)$$

and constant if $f [N - (1 - A)N_r] \propto N_r^{-1} [1 + B(N/N_r - 1)]^{1+\gamma}$. Expressing N_r in terms of
 x , we get

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto \frac{[N - x + B(x - AN)]^{1+\gamma}}{N - x}. \quad (27)$$

12 We can interpret $N - x$ as the decrease of the quantitative trait due to the existence of
 13 reproductive cells, and $x - AN$ as the increase in the quantitative trait (compared to undif-
 14 ferentiated organisms) due to somatic cells.

Let us now study how a change in the size of somatic cells affects the optimum number
 of reproductive cells. The isolines are given by $1/(N - x)$ for $B = 1$. For $B < 1$, we can

rewrite equation (27) as

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto \frac{\left[N \frac{1-BA}{1-B} - x\right]^{1+\gamma}}{N-x}, \quad (28)$$

1 and notice that $f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ approaches $(N-x)^\gamma$ for $B \rightarrow 0$. The shape of the isoline is entirely
 2 determined by the factor $(1-AB)/(1-B)$ and different combinations of parameters A and B
 3 can result in the same isoline. Since A appears only in the term $1-AB$, it has less influence
 4 on the shape of $f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ if B is small. This can be explained intuitively. If somatic cells are
 5 very small, they are not very costly and how efficient they are (compared to reproductive
 6 cells) is less important.

7 Figure 8a shows isolines for different parameter combinations. I choose $A = 0.1, 0.25,$
 8 $0.5,$ and $0.75,$ and $B = 0.02, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5,$ and $1.$ It illustrates the analytical results.
 9 Isolines change from $(N-x)^{-1}$ (purple line) to $(N-x)^\gamma$ (gray line) and different parameter
 10 combinations can result in similar isolines. The parameter A has little affect on the isoline
 11 if somatic cells are small (small B). The top axes of Figure 8a show how x corresponds
 12 to N_r for different values of A . Interestingly, if B is small enough, then isolines can have a
 13 negative slope. In other words, even a constant benefit function would promote the evolution
 14 of somatic cells. We can calculate that the slope of $f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ is negative at $x_{N_r=N} = AN$
 15 if $B < \gamma/(1+\gamma) = 1/5$. For somatic cells of that size the disadvantage of loosing a
 16 reproductive cell is compensated for by the size decrease (smaller organisms have higher
 17 rates of production). We will encounter this threshold again during our analysis of the
 18 complete (unconstrained) model.

19 Figure 8b shows the fitness, F , as a function of N_r . I plot F for $A = 0.1$ and indicate
 20 the maxima for the other A values. As expected, a decrease in B leads to an increase of F
 21 and a decrease of $N_{r,\text{opt}}$. Also, F and $N_{r,\text{opt}}$ increase with A , but less so if B is small.

1 **Appendix C: Multicellularity in organisms in which the**
2 **benefit of multicellularity depends on the number of re-**
3 **productive cells.**

4 In this section I analyze a small but significant variation of my model. To model the benefit
5 of multicellularity, I assumed that this benefit is a function of a quantitative trait to which so-
6 matic and reproductive cells contribute additively. In this section I analyze a model in which
7 the benefit of multicellularity (for a given value of the quantitative trait) does also depend on
8 the number of reproductive cells. In this version reproductive and somatic cells contribute
9 (additively) to the acquisition of a resource that is desperately needed by reproductive cells.
10 The more a reproductive cells has of this resource, the faster it can grow and the larger is
11 the probability of survival and, consequently, the fitness of the organism. Let $f(x)$ denote
12 the benefit from this resource if the organism manages to supply *each* reproductive cell with
13 an amount x of the resource.

If one somatic (reproductive) cell acquires β (α) of the resource, then a total of $\alpha N_r + \beta N_s$
can be allocated between the reproductive cells and each cell would receive $\frac{\alpha N_r + \beta N_s}{N_r}$. The
benefit of multicellularity is then given by

$$f(N_r, N_s) = f\left(\frac{\alpha N_r + \beta N_s}{N_r}\right). \quad (29)$$

and the fitness of the organism given by

$$F(N_r, N_s) = \frac{N_r}{(N_r + \beta N_s)^{1+\gamma}} f\left(\frac{\alpha N_r + \beta N_s}{N_r}\right). \quad (30)$$

14 In the following, I analyze this fitness function. I show that such benefits of multicol-
15 lularity are (a) an unlikely source for the evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity, (b)
16 differentiated organisms of constant size would have few reproductive cells, and (c) if organ-

1 ism size and the fraction of somatic cells are governed by $f(x)$ then the optimum number of
 2 reproductive cells is given by one.

3 **Undifferentiated Multicellularity**

4 It is easy to see that for $N_s = 0$, equation (30) simplifies to $F = N_r^{-\gamma} f(a)$. Fitness, F ,
 5 is strictly monotone decreasing with N_r and optimal for $N_r = 1$. Obviously, if all cells
 6 contributed linearly to the acquisition of a resource and divide that resource equally among
 7 each other, then each cell gets as much as it would get if it were on its own. In other words, if
 8 cells contribute linearly to the acquisition of a resource that is apportioned among them, then
 9 multicellularity conveys no advantages and a unicellular organism has the highest fitness.
 10 Limited resources that have to be divided between reproductive cells can only trigger the
 11 evolution of multicellularity if cells act synergistically. The multicellular organism has to be
 12 more than just the sum of its parts.

13 **Constant size**

For constant size $S = \alpha N_r + \beta N_s$, the fitness (30) is given by

$$F \propto N_r f(A + N_s/N_r) \tag{31}$$

$$= N_r f[S/(BN_r) - (1/B - A)]. \tag{32}$$

The amount of resources that each reproductive cell receives depends on A and B . It can
 range from $x_{N_r=S} = A$ to $x_{N_r=1} = A + (S - 1)/B$. The isolines are given by

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) \propto x + 1/B - A. \tag{33}$$

14 As one can see, the isolines are linear. For linear benefit functions $f(x) = cx$ with $f(S/B) < 1$
 15 the optimum number of reproductive cells equals one if $AB < 1$. For $B = 1$, this simplifies

1 to $A < 1$. More so, once differentiated multicellularity is advantageous the optimum number
 2 of reproductive cells is given by one. Figure 9 shows isolines and the non-linear relation
 3 between x and N_r for $A = 0.1$. I plot three possible benefit functions. It is obvious that only
 4 very steeply increasing benefit functions would lead to organisms with many reproductive
 5 cells. Most benefit functions would result in few reproductive cells.

6 The complete Model

7 Let us now analyze the unconstrained model. As in the main text, the optimum size of the
 8 organism as well as the optimum number of reproductive cells are governed by the benefit
 9 function $f(x)$. As we will see, we can use this to our advantage and calculate the optimum
 10 number of reproductive cells analytically. We can even calculate the isolines with respect to
 11 size and conclude that benefits from resources that have to be allocated between reproductive
 12 cells are an unlikely cause of the evolution of multicellularity.

The fitness is given by

$$F \propto N_r(N_r + BN_s)^{-(1+\gamma)} f\left(A + \frac{N_s}{N_r}\right). \quad (34)$$

If there is an optimum, it has to satisfy $\frac{\partial F}{\partial N_s} = 0$. We have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial N_s} = N_r \left(-(1 + \gamma)B(N_r + BN_s)^{-(2+\gamma)} f + (N_r + BN_s)^{-(1+\gamma)} N_r^{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) \quad (35)$$

and hence

$$(N_r + BN_s)^{-(1+\gamma)} N_r^{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = (1 + \gamma)B(N_r + BN_s)^{-(2+\gamma)} f \quad (36)$$

at optimum, which can be used to simplify

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_r} = & (N_r + BN_S)^{-(1+\gamma)} f - N_r(1 + \gamma)(N_r + BN_S)^{-(2+\gamma)} f \\ & - N_s(N_r + BN_S)^{-(1+\gamma)} N_r^{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

to

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial N_r} = - [(1 + \gamma)(N_r + BN_S)^2 - 1] (N_r + BN_S)^{-(1+\gamma)} f \quad (38)$$

which is always negative. Hence, whenever the fitness is constant with respect to changes in N_s , N_r will decrease. Since there can never be less than one reproductive cell the optimum number of reproductive cells is given by $N_{r,\text{opt}} = 1$. The fitness of the corresponding organism is given by

$$F \propto (1 + B(N - 1))^{-(1+\gamma)} f[N - (1 - A)]. \quad (39)$$

The isolines with respect to N are given by

$$f_{\text{iso}}(x) = [x + 1/B - A]^{1+\gamma}. \quad (40)$$

1 Hence, multicellularity based on divisible resources is only advantageous for convex benefit
 2 functions that grow faster than $\approx x^{1+\gamma}$. The resulting organism would contain one reproduc-
 3 tive cell and would generally be fairly small (contain few cells). This suggests that benefits
 4 from resources that have to be allocated between reproductive cells are an unlikely cause of
 5 the evolution of multicellularity.

1 References

- 2 Bell, G., 1985 *The Origin and Evolution of Sex*, chap. The origin and evolution of germ cells
3 as illustrated by the Volvocales. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- 4 Bonner, J. T., 1965 *Size and Cycle*. Princeton University Press.
- 5 Bonner, J. T., 1967 *The cellular slime molds*. Princeton University Press.
- 6 Bonner, J. T., 2001 *First Signals: The Evolution of Multicellular Development*. Princeton
7 University Press.
- 8 Bonner, J. T., 2003a Evolution of development in the cellular slime molds. *Evol Dev* 5,
9 305–13.
- 10 Bonner, J. T., 2003b On the origin of differentiation. *J Biosci* 28, 523–8.
- 11 Boraas, M., Seale, D. & Boxhorn, J., 1998 Phagotrophy by a flagellate selects for colonial
12 prey: A possible origin of multicellularity. *Evol. Ecol.* 12, 153–164.
- 13 Buss, L. W., 1988 *The Evolution of Individuality*. Princeton University Press.
- 14 Farnsworth, P. A., 1975 Proportionality in the pattern of differentiation of the cellular slime
15 mould dictyostelium discoideum and the time of its determination. *J Embryol Exp Morphol*
16 33, 869–77.
- 17 Goldstein, M., 1967 Colony differentiation in eudorina. *Can. J. Botany* 45, 1591.
- 18 Graham, L. E. & Wilcox, L. W., 1999 *Algae*. Prentice Hall, 1st edn.
- 19 King, N., 2004 The unicellular ancestry of animal development. *Dev Cell* 7, 313–25.
- 20 Kirk, D. L., 1997 *Volvox : A Search for the Molecular and Genetic Origins of Multicellularity*
21 *and Cellular Differentiation*. Cambridge University Press.
- 22 Knoll, A. H., 2003 *Life on a Young Planet: The First Three Billion Years of Evolution on*
23 *Earth*. Princeton University Press.
- 24 Koufopanou, V., 1994 The evolution of soma in the volvocales. *Am. Nat.* 143, 907–931.
- 25 Margulis, L., 1981 *Symbiosis in Cell Evolution*. W.H. Freeman & Company.
- 26 Maynard-Smith, J. & Szathmary, E., 1997 *The Major Transitions in Evolution*. Oxford
27 University Press, reprint edn.
- 28 Michod, R., 1997 Cooperation and conflict in the evolution of individuality .1. multilevel
29 selection of the organism. *Am. Nat.* 149, 607–645.
- 30 Michod, R. E. & Roze, D., 1997 Transitions in individuality. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*
31 264, 853–7.

- 1 Michod, R. E. & Roze, D., 2001 Cooperation and conflict in the evolution of multicellularity.
2 *Heredity* 86, 1–7.
- 3 Nowak, M. A., 2006 Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science* 314, 1560–3.
- 4 O’Connor, K. A. & Zusman, D. R., 1991 Development in myxococcus xanthus involves
5 differentiation into two cell types, peripheral rods and spores. *J Bacteriol* 173, 3318–33.
- 6 Peters, R. H., 1986 *The Ecological Implications of Body Size*. Cambridge University Press.
- 7 Phillips, R., 1958 Floating communities of algae in a north-carolina pond. *Ecology* 39, 765–
8 766.
- 9 Rainey, P. B. & Travisano, M., 1998 Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment.
10 *Nature* 394, 69–72.
- 11 Solari, C. A., Ganguly, S., Kessler, J. O., Michod, R. E. & Goldstein, R. E., 2006 Multi-
12 cellularity and the functional interdependence of motility and molecular transport. *Proc*
13 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103, 1353–8.
- 14 Sommer, U. & Gliwicz, Z., 1986 Long-range vertical migration of volvox in tropical lake
15 cahora bassa (mozambique). *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 31, 650–653.
- 16 Velicer, G. J. & Yu, Y.-T. N., 2003 Evolution of novel cooperative swarming in the bacterium
17 myxococcus xanthus. *Nature* 425, 75–8.




Figure 1:

Figure 1: Cost of somatic cells in differentiated organisms. If the rate of production is independent of organism size, then every undifferentiated organism has the same fitness. Four unicellular organisms produce 16 cells after two cell division (first row), as does one four-cell organism (second row). A four-cell organism with two somatic cells (third row) produces half the biomass of an undifferentiated organism, because only half its cells are able to contribute to the next generation. If the two somatic cells are extremely small (fourth row) then nearly all the biomass is concentrated in reproductive cells and fitness is equal to the fitness of an undifferentiated organism. In general the fitness of a differentiated organism relative to an undifferentiated is given by the fraction of biomass that is used for reproduction, that is, by $N_r/(N_r + BN_s) = 1 - BN_s/(N_r + BN_s)$, where B is the size of a somatic cell relative to the size of a reproductive cell.




Figure 2:

Figure 2: The use of benefit functions to model the benefit of multicellularity. (a) Predator evasion: Multicellularity can be beneficial by allowing the multicellular organism to evade predation. We can model this benefit as a function of the organism size (a quantitative trait). Multicellularity is not beneficial if the size of the organism does not exceed the predators upper prey size limit. Large benefits can be expected for size increases that surpasses this prey size limit. Once this threshold is exceeded and the organism immune against predation, further size increases bring little additional benefits. (b) Flagellation: Multicellularity can also increase the motility of an organism by increasing its flagellar drive (a quantitative trait). Initial increases in motility can bring large benefits because they increase an organism's ability to reach favorable environments. At some point, however, a further increase in flagellar drive brings little benefits because the organism is already able to access the most favorable environment.




Figure 3: Optimum number of (reproductive) cells in undifferentiated organisms. The gray curves show isolines, i.e., benefit functions, $f_{\text{iso}}(x) = x^{-\gamma}$ (for $\gamma = 1/4$), for which the fitness (5) of the organism is constant with respect to changes in the number of cells (see Eq. 7). The solid and dotted lines show linear benefit functions. The dashed curve shows a concave benefit function. The number of reproductive cells is optimal if $f(x) \leq f_{\text{iso}}(x)$ for the isoline with $f(x_{\text{opt}}) = f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}})$, where $x_{\text{opt}} = aN_{r,\text{opt}}$. Black bullets indicate the optima, $(x_{\text{opt}}, f_{\text{iso}}(x_{\text{opt}}))$, for the given benefit functions.





Figure 4:

Figure 4: Optimum number of reproductive cells in organisms of constant size ($N = 32$) with somatic cells that are as large as reproductive cells ($B = 1$). (a) The gray curves show isolines with respect to changes in N_r (see Eq. 9). Isolines are independent of A for $B = 1$. But, since $x = N - (1 - A)N_r$, the parameter A affects the relation between N_r and x . The top axis illustrates how this relation changes with A . (b) Fitness of an organism as a function of N_r . The curves correspond to the benefit functions from above for $A = 0.1$. To keep the figure uncluttered, I do not plot the fitness curves for $A = 0.25, 0.5$, and 0.75 , but indicate only the maxima.




Figure 5: Optimum fraction of reproductive cells. If the size of an organism and the fraction of reproductive cells, q , can adjust freely, then the optimum fraction of reproductive cells is independent of $f(x)$ and given by (21). The optimum fraction depends on A (the contribution of a reproductive cell to the quantitative trait relative to the contribution of a somatic cell), B (the size of a somatic cell relative to the size of a reproductive cell), and γ (the allometric exponent). This implicit plot shows (for $\gamma = 1/4$) which values A and B result in $q_{\text{opt}} = 1, 0.75, 0.5, 0.25$, and 0.125 . Differentiated multicellularity for an organism of size N is beneficial if $q_{\text{opt}} < 1 - 1/N$. Note that A becomes irrelevant for small B .





Figure 6: Fraction and size of somatic cells in volvocine algae. I plot the fraction of reproductive cells, $q = N_r/N$, as a function of the size of somatic cells relative to reproductive cells, $B = \beta/\alpha$. Points show data collected by Koufopanou (1994). The solid curve shows the model prediction (21) for $\gamma = 1/4$ and $A = 0$ (reproductive cells do not contribute to the quantitative trait and the benefit of multicellularity is just a largely arbitrary function of the number of somatic cells). An allometric exponent, γ , of $1/5$ describes the data best (minimizes the mean squared error for data points with $B < 3 \times 10^{-2}$). The dashed line shows the model prediction for $\gamma = 1/5$. The dotted line shows $\gamma^{-1}B$, the limit of q_{opt} for $B \rightarrow 0$.



quantitative trait (x)

Figure 7:

Figure 7: Isolines for organisms of constant size, $S = N_r + BN_s$. The gray curves in the lower part of the figure show isolines with respect to N_r (see Eq. 24). The top part of this figure shows the which x corresponds to which N_r . Isolines are independent of A and approach S/B asymptotically. Decreasing B would increase S/B , change the position of the isoline-asymptote and the maximum possible value for x . An increase in A would increase AS and steepen the line that maps x on N_r .





Figure 8:

Figure 8: Optimum number of reproductive cells in organisms with a constant number of cells ($N = 32$) that have small somatic cells ($B = 0.02, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5,$ and 1). (a) Isolines (see Eq. 28) change with B (and A) from the purple curve ($B = 1$) to the gray curve ($B = 0$). I plot isolines for $A = 0.1$ (solid curves), $0.25, 0.5,$ and 0.75 (dashed curves). The relation between x and N_r is independent of B and shown at the top axis. (b) Fitness of an organism as a function of N_r . The curves correspond to the benefit functions from above for $A = 0.1$. For $A = 0.25, 0.5,$ and 0.75 I mark the maximum for each fitness function. Assuming that cells are spherical, the figure legend shows the size differences between somatic and reproductive cells for the given B values. As expected, decreasing B decreases $N_{r,\text{opt}}$. The position and spread of the maxima shows that for small somatic cells (small B) the ability of reproductive cells to contribute to the quantitative trait (parameter A) has little effect on $N_{r,\text{opt}}$ and the fitness of the organism.




Figure 9:

Figure 9: Isolines for organisms of constant size, $S = N_r + BN_s$, that benefit from resources that have to be allocated between reproductive cells. The gray curves in the lower part of the figure show isolines with respect to N_r for $A = 0.1$ (see Eq. 33). Isolines change with A and B since they contain the term $1/B - A$. The top part of this figure shows how N_r changes as a function of x . This function depends on the parameters A (position of the curve) and B (extension of the curve to the right).

Symbol	Interpretation
N_r	Number of reproductive cells
N_s	Number of somatic cells (an organism is undifferentiated if $N_s = 0$)
α	Size of a reproductive cell
β	Size of a somatic cell
$B = \beta/\alpha$	The size of a somatic cell relative to the size of a reproductive cell; B is bound to $[0, 1]$
a	Contribution of a reproductive cell to the quantitative trait
b	Contribution of a somatic cell to the quantitative trait
$A = a/b$	Contribution of a reproductive cell to the quantitative trait relative to the contribution of a somatic cell; A is bound to $[0, 1]$
x	The value of the quantitative trait
$f(x)$	The benefit function. It captures the extend to which the organism benefits from the quantitative trait. The benefit function is scaled such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 1$.
γ	The allometric exponent which is approximately $1/4$

Table 1: Notation summary