

# Diploidy, homologous recombination repair, and the selective advantage for sexual reproduction in unicellular organisms

Maya Kleiman and Emmanuel Tannenbaum\*

*Department of Chemistry, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Be'er-Sheva, Israel*

This paper develops mathematical models describing the evolutionary dynamics of both asexually and sexually reproducing populations of diploid unicellular organisms. The asexual and sexual life cycles are based on the asexual and sexual life cycles in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, or Baker's yeast, which normally reproduces by asexual budding, but switches to sexual reproduction when stressed. The mathematical models consider three reproduction pathways: (1) Asexual reproduction. (2) Self-fertilization (3) Sexual reproduction. We also consider two forms of genome organization. In one case, we assume that the genome consists of two multi-gene chromosomes, while in the second case we consider the opposite extreme and assume that each gene defines a separate chromosome, which we call the multi-chromosome genome. These two cases are considered in order to explore the role that recombination has on the mutation-selection balance and the selective advantage of the various reproduction strategies. We assume that the purpose of diploidy is to provide redundancy, so that damage to a gene may be repaired using the other, presumably undamaged copy (a process known as *homologous recombination repair*). As a result, we assume that the fitness of the organism only depends on the number of homologous gene pairs that contain at least one functional copy of a given gene. If the organism has at least one functional copy of every gene in the genome, we assume a fitness of 1, and we assume that each homologous gene pair without a functional copy of a given gene induces a fitness penalty of  $\alpha$ . However, we assume that, even among organisms with at least one functional copy of every gene, there is an effective fitness penalty for having faulty copies of genes. This fitness penalty arises as a result of the repair of a damaged functional gene when its homologue has a fixed mutation. The repair process can lead to the mutation being transferred to the functional gene, leading to the loss of functionality of both copies of a given gene. For nearly all of the reproduction strategies we consider, we find that the mean fitnesses have an upper bound of  $\max\{2e^{-N\epsilon} - 1, 0\}$ , where  $N$  is the number of genes in the haploid set of the genome, and  $\epsilon$  is the probability that a given DNA template strand of a given gene produces a mutated daughter during replication. The only exceptions are the two- and multi-chromosome sexual reproduction pathways. These strategies are found to have a mean fitness that can exceed the mean fitness of all of the other strategies, provided that  $N\epsilon$  is sufficiently large. The critical value of  $N\epsilon$  beyond which the sexual pathways have a higher mean fitness than the other strategies decreases as  $\alpha$  approaches 1. Furthermore, while the other reproduction strategies experience a total loss of viability due to the steady accumulation of deleterious mutations once  $N\epsilon$  exceeds  $\ln 2$ , the transition in the sexual pathways may be delayed to arbitrarily high values of  $N\epsilon$  provided that  $\alpha$  is sufficiently close to 1. We explicitly allow for mitotic recombination in this work, which has been found, using previous models, to provide an identical selective advantage as sexual reproduction. With the models used in this study, we do not find any advantage for mitotic recombination over other reproduction strategies. However, sexual reproduction with random mating does have a selective advantage over other reproduction strategies. The results of this paper suggest that sex provides a selective advantage by acting on "non-essential" genes, i.e., genes that confer a fitness advantage to the organism, but are not necessary for the organism to grow and reproduce. The more "non-essential" the genes, as measured by how close  $\alpha$  is to 1 in our model, the stronger the selective advantage for sex. The results of this paper also suggest an explanation for why unicellular organisms such as *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Baker's yeast) switch to a sexual mode of reproduction when stressed. Finally, while the results of this paper are based on modeling mutation-propagation in unicellular organisms, they nevertheless suggest that, in more complex organisms with significantly larger genomes, sex is necessary to prevent the loss of viability of a population due to genetic drift.

PACS numbers: 87.23.-n, 87.23.Kg, 87.16.Ac

Keywords: Sexual reproduction, diploid, haploid, quasispecies, random mating, selective mating, recombination

## I. INTRODUCTION

The evolution and maintenance of sexual reproduction is regarded as one of the central problems of evolutionary biology (Bell 1982; Williams 1975; Maynard-Smith 1978; Michod 1995; Hurst and Peck 1996; Agrawal 2006; Visser and Elena 2007). The various theories for the se-

---

\*Electronic address: emanuelt@bgu.ac.il

lective advantage for sex fall into one of two general categories: The first category of theories argues that sex provides a mechanism to purge deleterious mutations from a genome (Kondrashov 1988; Muller 1964; Bruggeman et al. 2003; Paland and Lynch 2006; Bernstein et al. 1984; Michod 1995, Nedelcu et al. 2004; Barton and Otto 2005), while the second category of theories argues that sex provides greater genetic variability that allows populations to adapt more quickly to changing environments (Bell 1982; Hamilton et al. 1990; Howard and Lively 1994; Keightley and Otto 2006).

The first category of theories has two versions: The first version, called the *Deterministic Mutation Hypothesis*, argues simply that sex provides a mechanism for purging deleterious mutations from a population, and thereby repair the germ line (Kondrashov 1988). The problem with this theory is that it requires what appears to be an overly restrictive assumption regarding the dependence of organismal fitness on the number of deleterious mutations in the genome: In order for the Deterministic Mutation Hypothesis to hold, the organismal fitness must decrease increasingly rapidly with the number of deleterious mutations. This is a phenomenon known as *synergistic epistasis*, and the problem with this assumption is that it is not at all clear whether or not it is correct. Furthermore, the theory only works if mutation rates are at least one per genome per replication cycle, which is not the case for many simpler organisms that are capable of replicating sexually.

The second version of the first category of theories argues that sex prevents the accumulation of mutations in a finite population. The argument is that a finite, asexually replicating population will steadily accumulate deleterious mutations over time. This phenomenon has been termed the *Muller's Ratchet* (Muller 1964). Sexual reproduction provides a mechanism for restoring mutation-free genomes, and can thereby slow down or even stop the Muller's Ratchet. The problem with this theory is that it relies on the assumption of a small, finite population. This is an ill-defined term, since it is not clear what the cutoff for a "small" population should be.

The second category of theories also has two versions: The first version argues that sexual reproduction allows a population to adapt more quickly to changing environments (Bell 1982). The idea is that sexual reproduction allows for recombination amongst different organisms, and thereby increases the genetic variation of a population. In a dynamic environment, this increased variation will increase the chances that some organism has a fit genome, thereby leading to faster adaptation (Bell 1982). This theory is sometimes called the *Vicar of Bray Hypothesis*, named after an English cleric who was known for changing his opinion as political circumstances dictated (Bell 1982).

The second version of this category of theories is known as the *Red Queen Hypothesis*, and states that sexual reproduction evolved as a way for relatively slowly replicating host organisms to survive in a co-evolutionary

"genetic arms race" with quickly replicating parasites. This theory derives its name from a character named the Red Queen in Lewis Carroll's *In the Looking Glass*, who states, "It takes all the running you can do to stay in one place" (Hamilton et al. 1990).

While this second category of theories is not necessarily incorrect, it is not clear that it offers a single, universal explanation for the evolution and maintenance of sexual reproduction. The reason for this is that there are sexually reproducing organisms that have remained essentially unevolved for millions of years in what appear to be fairly static environments (e.g. sharks and crocodiles). As a result, while sexual reproduction may indeed have a selective advantage over asexual reproduction in dynamic environments, it is not clear that a dynamic environment is a necessary condition for sexual reproduction to be advantageous over asexual reproduction.

In this paper, we develop mathematical models describing asexual and sexual reproduction in unicellular organisms, where we take life cycles that are based on the asexual and sexual life cycles in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Baker's yeast) (Herskowitz 1988; Mable and Otto 1998; De Massy et al. 1994; Roeder 1995). We assume multi-gene genomes comprised of semiconservatively replicating, double-stranded DNA molecules. While we still make a number of simplifying assumptions, we nevertheless believe that the models considered in this paper are sufficiently realistic to be relevant for actual biological systems. Consequently, we believe that the results we obtain in this paper may be used to draw definite conclusions about the relative selective advantage of various reproduction strategies in unicellular organisms.

We consider three distinct reproduction mechanisms: Asexual reproduction, self-fertilization, and sexual reproduction. Furthermore, for each reproduction mechanism we consider two extremes of genome organization, in order to explore the effect of recombination on the selective advantage for the various reproduction strategies: A two-chromosome, multi-gene genome, and a multi-chromosome genome where each chromosome consists of a single gene.

The mathematical models being considered here assume that the only purpose of diploidy is to provide genetic redundancy, so that all organisms whose genomes contain at least one functional copy of every gene have the wild-type fitness, taken to be 1. We assume that the fitness of the organism is reduced by a factor of  $\alpha$  for every homologous gene pair that lacks a functional copy of a given gene. The closer  $\alpha$  is to 0, the more we assume that the genes in the genome are essential, while the closer  $\alpha$  is to 1, the more the genes are non-essential (meaning that the lack of a functional copy of a given gene has a small effect on fitness). Of course, actual genomes contain a mix of genes with varying degrees of essentiality. For our purposes, we are averaging over the various levels of essentiality and assuming a single value of  $\alpha$  for all genes. It should also be noted that we are not assuming either synergistic or antagonistic epistasis

in this model.

Although our model assumes that the fitness of an organism is unaffected as long as it has at least one functional copy of every gene, we nevertheless assume that homologous recombination repair gives rise to a fitness penalty that increases with the number of homologous gene pairs in the genome that have a defective copy of a gene: Because diploidy provides a mechanism to repair damaged genes using the presumably undamaged homologues, then, if a functional gene becomes damaged, and if its homologue has a mutation, repair of the damaged gene can result in the mutation being transferred from the homologue to the damaged gene. This results in two defective copies of a gene in the genome, which leads to a loss of fitness. As the number of mutated genes in the genome increases, the probability of repair-induced fitness loss increases as well.

Based on the analysis that follows, we obtain that the mean fitnesses at mutation-selection balance for nearly all reproduction pathways have an upper bound of  $\max\{2e^{-N\epsilon} - 1, 0\}$ , where  $N$  is the number of genes in the haploid set of the genome, and  $\epsilon$  is the probability that a given template DNA strand of a given gene produces a mutant daughter as a result of replication. The only exception is for the case of sexual reproduction for both the two- and multi-chromosome genomes. Here, for a given value of  $\alpha$ , there is a critical value of  $N\epsilon$  beyond which the mean fitness exceeds  $\max\{2e^{-N\epsilon} - 1, 0\}$ . This critical value of  $N\epsilon$  is infinite for  $\alpha = 0$ , and steadily decreases to 0 as  $\alpha$  approaches 1.

An important result of our analysis is that, except for sexual reproduction, all of the other reproduction strategies experience a total loss of population viability once  $N\epsilon$  exceeds  $\ln 2$ . Here, the evolutionary dynamics of the population is characterized by the steady accumulation of deleterious mutations, leading to a steady-state mean fitness of 0. However, for sexual reproduction, this loss of viability may be delayed to arbitrarily high values of  $N\epsilon$  as long as  $\alpha > 0$ . This result is interesting, for, although it is based on an analysis of unicellular organisms, it nevertheless suggests that sexual reproduction is necessary to prevent population extinction in more complex organisms that have long genomes. For example, for *S. cerevisiae*,  $N\epsilon$  is on the order of 0.01, which is well below  $\ln 2 \approx 0.69$ , while for humans (*H. sapiens*),  $N\epsilon$  is on the order of 3, which is considerably larger than  $\ln 2$ . Thus, *S. cerevisiae* may not need to reproduce sexually in order to remain viable (though sexual reproduction provides a selective advantage under stressful conditions), but humans may simply die out if they were to reproduce asexually.

## II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Genetic damage and the need for diploidy

Diploidy is a common feature of many eukaryotic organisms (Visser and Elena 2007). Along with diploidy comes the question as to the selective advantage that it provides. One possible explanation is that, by having an extra copy of every gene, organisms can increase the total rate of gene expression, and thereby process environmental resources at a higher rate, which presumably leads to a higher fitness (Crow and Kimura 1965; Kondrashov and Crow 1991; Perrot et al. 1991).

The problem with this explanation is that it is not at all clear why two is some kind of “magic number” providing the optimal fitness. It makes more sense that the fitness advantage from having multiple copies of a gene should be highly gene-dependent, so that cells should not be expected to be diploid, or even to have a fixed number of copies of every gene. Rather, it would make more sense for cells to keep different numbers of copies of different genes.

However, since cells are not observed to keep differing number of copies of different genes (there are a few exceptions to this rule), it makes sense that the purpose of diploidy is to provide a mechanism to repair damaged genes via homologous recombination repair (Visser and Elena 2007). We may develop a mathematical model describing this hypothesis, which also suggests a criterion for determining under what circumstances it is advantageous to keep additional copies of genes in the genome.

We begin our model development with a single chromosome: Due to various factors such as radiation, free radicals, and other chemical agents, the DNA strands of this chromosome are constantly being damaged. However, various genetic repair mechanisms, such as Base-Excision Repair (BER), Nucleotide Excision Repair (NER), and the SOS Response exist to repair this genetic damage. As long as damage at a given site is localized to only one of the strands, then the complementarity of DNA means that the other strand may be used to repair the damage.

Assuming that the accumulation of single-strand damage is a first-order process, we let  $\lambda_e$  denote the rate constant for the production of new single-strand damage sites. If we assume that genetic repair is also a first-order process (which is obtained by assuming second-order kinetics in the interaction between a fixed number of repair enzymes and the damaged sites, an assumption that likely only holds for low levels of genetic damage), and if we let the rate constant for repair be  $\lambda_r$ , then we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dl_L}{dt} &= \lambda_e(L - l_L - l_R - l_B) - l_L\lambda_r \\ \frac{dl_R}{dt} &= \lambda_e(L - l_L - l_R - l_B) - l_R\lambda_r \\ \frac{dl_B}{dt} &= \lambda_e(l_L + l_R) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $L$  is the genome length,  $l_L$  denotes the number of




FIG. 1: Illustration of possible forms of genetic damage to a double-stranded DNA molecule. The blue regions signify undamaged DNA, while the black regions signify damaged DNA.  $l_L$  refers to the number of base-pairs where damage is only on the left strand,  $l_R$  refers to the number of base-pairs where damage is only on the right strand, and  $l_B$  refers to the number of base-pairs where damage is on both strands.

damaged sites on one of the DNA strands, designated the left strand,  $l_R$  denotes the number of damaged sites on the other DNA strand, designated the right strand, and  $l_B$  denotes the number of damaged sites on both DNA strands (see Figure 1).

We may add the first two equations to obtain,

$$\frac{d(l_L + l_R)}{dt} = 2\lambda_e(L - l_B) - (2\lambda_e + \lambda_r)(l_L + l_R) \quad (2)$$

If we assume that  $\lambda_e$  is small and  $\lambda_r$  is large, then  $l_L + l_R$  reaches a quasi-steady-state value over time scales that are short compared to the rate of change of  $l_B$ . We may therefore solve for the quasi-steady-state value of  $l_L + l_R$  and use it to obtain an expression for  $dl_B/dt$ . The result is,

$$l_L + l_R = \frac{2\lambda_e}{2\lambda_e + \lambda_r}(L - l_B) \quad (3)$$

so that,

$$\frac{dl_B}{dt} = \frac{2\lambda_e^2}{2\lambda_e + \lambda_r}(L - l_B) \quad (4)$$

To translate this into a first-order rate constant, let us assume that the cell has  $N$  genes (where  $N$  is the total number of genes, and not necessarily the number in the haploid set), and let us assume that each gene consists of  $L_G$  base-pairs. Then after an infinitesimal time period  $dt$  the value of  $l_B$  is,

$$\delta l_B = \frac{2\lambda_e^2}{2\lambda_e + \lambda_r} L_G N \left(1 - \frac{l_B}{L_G N}\right) dt \quad (5)$$

If the number of genes in the genome is large, so that  $l_B/(L_G N) \ll 1$ , then it may be assumed that the damaged base-pairs all lie on distinct genes, so that the value of  $\delta l_B$  is the value of damaged genes, which we denote by  $\delta N$ . This gives,

$$\delta N = \frac{2\lambda_e^2}{2\lambda_e + \lambda_r} L_G N dt \quad (6)$$

which means that a given gene has a probability of  $2\lambda_e/(2\lambda_e + \lambda_r)L_G\lambda_e dt$  of sustaining damage at both bases of a base-pair during the time  $dt$ .

If we define  $\lambda = 2\lambda_e/(2\lambda_e + \lambda_r)L_G$ , then in a diploid organism we have that  $\lambda dt$  is the probability that a gene will need to be repaired via homologous recombination repair during the time  $dt$ . We will assume in this paper that repair is sufficiently fast that any double-stranded lesion may be taken to be repaired instantaneously. In the case of a haploid organism,  $\lambda dt$  is the probability that a given gene becomes irreversibly damaged. If a haploid sustains a sufficient amount of irreversible damage to its genome, then the haploid will die.

The above analysis suggests a criterion for determining when diploidy provides a selective advantage over haploidy: If the fitness  $k$  of the haploid organism is large compared to  $\lambda N$ , the rate constant for the accumulation of irreversibly damaged genes in the genome, then the additional maintenance costs associated with maintaining extra copies of genes is such that diploidy is the disadvantageous strategy. However, as the fitness of the organism decreases, the gene-damage rate constant may become significant, so that diploidy may be necessary to ensure the survival of the population.

## B. Description of the organismal genomes and fitness landscapes

In this subsection, we describe the two modes of genome organization that we will consider in this paper. Figure 2 may be useful for what follows.

### 1. Two-chromosomed genome

We begin with the two-chromosome model. Here, we assume that a unicellular organism has a diploid genome consisting of two chromosomes, where each chromosome has  $N$  genes, labelled  $1 \dots N$ . We also assume that with each gene is associated a “master” sequence (actually a pair of complementary sequences, since we are dealing with double-stranded DNA), corresponding to a functional copy of the gene, while any mutation to the master sequence renders the gene non-functional. This is the analogue of the single-fitness-peak approximation often made in quasispecies models of evolutionary dynamics (Bull et al. 2005; Wilke ; Tannenbaum and Shakhnovich 2005). While this assumption is obviously oversimplified (indeed, recent research suggests that genes may, on




FIG. 2: Illustration of the two different forms of genome organization being considered. In the two-chromosome genome, a single chromosome contains the entire haploid complement of genes, while in the multi-chromosome genome, each gene defines a separate chromosome, so that genes belonging to distinct homologous pairs segregate independently of one another. Functional copies of genes are colored blue, while non-functional copies, i.e. copies with fixed mutations, are colored red.

average, sustain up to six mutations before losing functionality (Zeldovich et al. 2007)), it is the simplest non-trivial landscape that allows for mutation and selection (as opposed to random genetic drift). Furthermore, the single-fitness-peak landscape reflects the fact that only a small fraction of all gene sequences will encode a gene carrying out a specific function, which is why the single-fitness-peak approximation has been known to provide correct order-of-magnitude estimates of various biological parameters (Kamp and Bornholdt 2002).

We may denote a given chromosome by  $\sigma = s_1 s_2 \dots s_N$ , where each  $s_i = 1$  if gene  $i$  is functional, and  $s_i = 0$  if gene  $i$  is non-functional. This means that the genome of a given organism may be represented by  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ , where  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  represent each of the two chromosomes in the genome.

During replication, the two DNA strands of each chromosome separate, and each strand forms the template for the synthesis of a complementary daughter strand (Tannenbaum and Shakhnovich 2005). Because mutations can occur during each daughter strand synthesis, both daughter genes of a given parent gene may contain mutations. We let  $p$  denote the probability that a template strand from a master copy of a gene forms a mutation-free daughter, so that  $1 - p$  is the probability that the template strand forms a mutated daughter. If the template strand already has a mutation, then we assume that sequence lengths are sufficiently long that any new mutations occur in a previously unmutated portion of the strand, so that a mutated template strand

forms a non-functional daughter gene with probability 1. This assumption is known as the *neglect of backmutations* (Tannenbaum and Shakhnovich 2005).

We also define  $\epsilon = 1 - p$ , and we define  $\mu = N\epsilon$ .  $\mu$  is the average number of mutated genes produced per replication cycle per chromosome.

It should be noted that we are not necessarily assuming that the only source of mutations in the genome is due to point-mutations during replication. The model allows for mutations that accumulate in the genome in between replications, due to base modifications and damage that occurs as a result of free radicals, radiation, and spontaneous chemical alterations. During the growth phase of the cell, repair mechanisms are constantly at work repairing this genetic damage. However, these genetic repair mechanisms are not infinitely fast, and so cannot completely eliminate all genetic damage. As a result, at the time of replication, there will always be some bases that are damaged, which can then lead to the fixation of mutations in the daughter genome as a consequence of daughter strand synthesis. This effect also leads to an effective per genome, per replication cycle point mutation rate that is somewhat larger than would be expected if one considered daughter strand synthesis errors alone.

We let  $r_i$  denote the probability of mitotic recombination in this model (Mandegar and Otto 2007), which is the probability that the two daughter chromosomes of a given parent co-segregate into the identical daughter cell (mitotic recombination generally refers to individual genes. However, in this model, we assume that the genes on a given chromosome all co-segregate together, so that  $r_i$  in this case refers to co-segregation of chromosomes. In the multi-chromosome model to be discussed below, individual genes may segregate independently of one another, so that  $r_i$  then more accurately reflects the biological definition of mitotic recombination).

We assume that cells replicate with first-order growth kinetics. We let  $\kappa_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}$  denote the first-order growth rate constant of cells with genome  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ , and we let  $n_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}$  denote the number of organisms in the population with genome  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ .

We define an ordered strand-pair representation of the population, by defining  $n_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} = (1/2)n_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}$  if  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$ , and  $n_{(\sigma, \sigma)} = n_{\{\sigma, \sigma\}}$ . We also define  $\kappa_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} = \kappa_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}$ . The ordered strand-pair representation leads to a method for characterizing a given ordered strand-pair by three parameters, denoted  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ .  $l_{10}$  denotes the number of homologous gene pairs for which the allele in  $\sigma_1$  is functional (i.e. a 1 gene) and the allele in  $\sigma_2$  is non-functional (i.e. a 0 gene).  $l_{01}$  denotes the number of homologous gene pairs for which the allele in  $\sigma_1$  is non-functional, and the allele in  $\sigma_2$  is functional.  $l_{00}$  denotes the number of homologous gene pairs where both alleles in  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are non-functional. We may also define  $l_{11}$  to be the number of homologous gene pairs where both alleles in  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are functional. Note that  $l_{11} = N - l_{10} - l_{01} - l_{00}$ .

We let  $p(\sigma, \sigma')$  denote the probability that a template

strand of parent chromosome  $\sigma$  produces daughter chromosome  $\sigma'$ .

Finally, we assume that the fitness of an organism is defined by the number of homologous gene pairs that lack a functional copy of that particular gene. If every homologous pair contains at least one functional copy of every gene, then the organism has a wild-type fitness of 1. We then assume that every homologous pair lacking a functional copy of a given gene leads to a fitness penalty of  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , so that  $\kappa_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} = \alpha^{l_{00}}$ . The closer  $\alpha$  is to 0, the more we are assuming that the genes are essential, while the closer  $\alpha$  is to 1, the more we are assuming that the genes are non-essential. Real organismal genomes contain a mix of “essential” and “non-essential” genes. However, for the purposes of this model, we are averaging over the genome and taking a single value of  $\alpha$  for all genes.

## 2. Multi-chromosomed genome

For the multi-chromosomed genome, we assume a diploid genome consisting of  $N$  homologous gene-pairs, where each gene defines a separate chromosome, giving rise to a genome consisting of  $2N$  genes. We assume that the homologous pairs segregate independently of one another, though for each homologous pair we may assume a mitotic recombination probability  $r_i$ , defined as in the previous sub-subsection. Indeed, unless otherwise specified, all of the definitions in the multi-gene, two-chromosome model are the same for the multi-chromosome model being considered here.

Because the genes all lie on separate chromosomes, a diploid genome may be characterized by the two parameters  $l_{10}, l_{00}$ , as opposed to the three parameters  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$  as in the previous subsection. Here, a diploid genome characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{00}$  has exactly  $l_{10}$  homologous pairs with one functional gene and one non-functional gene (i.e. a 1 and a 0), and  $l_{00}$  homologous pairs with two non-functional genes. As before, we have  $l_{11} = N - l_{10} - l_{00}$ .

### C. Homologous recombination repair and fitness landscapes

To analyze how homologous recombination repair affects the accumulation of mutations in a genome (see Figure 3), let us first consider a homologous gene pair where both genes are functional. The probability that a given gene accumulates double-stranded damage during a time  $dt$  is  $\lambda dt$ , and so the probability that a gene from a homologous pair accumulates double-stranded damage is  $2\lambda dt$  (the probability that both genes from a homologous pair accumulate genetic damage during the time  $dt$  is of order  $dt^2$  and may be ignored).

If we first consider the two-chromosome genome model, then, for a genome with  $N$  homologous pairs charac-




FIG. 3: Illustration of the process of homologous recombination repair. A gene sustains double-stranded damage (shown in black). The region around this damage is excised, and a DNA strand from the undamaged homologous gene is excised and inserted into the damaged region. Daughter strand synthesis then restores both genes.

terized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ , we have that the genome-wide probability that a gene from a 11 homologous pair accumulated double-stranded damage during the time  $dt$  is  $2(N - l_{10} - l_{01} - l_{00})\lambda dt$ . Now, given a gene in a homologous pair that accumulated damage, we assume that this gene is immediately repaired via homologous recombination repair. This implies that a certain length of DNA segment, denoted  $l_{HR}$ , from the undamaged gene is excised and used to re-synthesize the damaged portion of the gene. This process requires daughter strand synthesis to re-create the damaged gene, as well as a daughter strand synthesis to replace the excised strand in the undamaged gene. Because mutations can occur in both daughter strand syntheses, homologous recombination repair involving two functional copies of a gene may lead to the fixation of a mutation in either the undamaged or the damaged gene.

To calculate the probability that a 11 homologous pair becomes a 10 or a 01 homologous pair as a result of homologous recombination repair, we proceed as follows: We assume that the per-base mismatch probability is given by  $\epsilon'$ , where this probability is taken to be the same mismatch probability during DNA replication, and where it is also assumed that this probability includes various error-correction mechanisms such as DNA proofreading and mismatch repair.

If  $\epsilon'$  is assumed to be small, then the probability of a mismatch during a homologous recombination repair daughter strand synthesis is  $l_{HR}\epsilon'$ . The probability that this mismatch is then fixed as a mutation in the genome is given by  $l_{HR}\epsilon'/2$ , since there is a 50% probability that the mismatch will be eliminated using the parent base as the template, and a 50% probability that the mismatch will

be eliminated using the daughter base as the template.

Now, if each gene has  $L_G$  base pairs, then the probability that, during replication, a given parent template strand from the gene produces a daughter with a fixed mutation is  $L_G\epsilon'/2$ . Since this quantity is simply  $\epsilon$  by our previous definition, we have that  $l_{HR}\epsilon/2 = (l_{HR}/L_G)\epsilon$ .

For a 11 pair to produce a 10 pair as a result of homologous recombination repair, either the left gene is damaged and a daughter strand synthesis error occurs in the re-synthesis of the excised strand in the undamaged gene, or the right gene is damaged and a daughter strand synthesis error occurs in the re-synthesis of the damaged portion of the gene. In either case the probability of producing a mutated daughter is  $(l_{HR}/L_G)\epsilon$ , so since the probability of damage in either the right or left gene is  $2(N - l_{10} - l_{01} - l_{00})\lambda dt$ , so that the genome-wide probability of a 11  $\rightarrow$  10 transition is given by  $2(N - l_{10} - l_{01} - l_{00})\lambda(l_{HR}/L_G)\epsilon dt$ .

Now, we are interested in the limit very large genomes, so that we consider  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . However, we hold  $\mu$  constant in this limit, which is equivalent to fixing the average number of replication errors per genome per replication cycle or, equivalently, to fixing the per genome replication fidelity. In this limit, the probability of a 11  $\rightarrow$  10 transition then becomes  $2(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda\mu dt$ . Following a similar argument, we obtain that the probability of a 11  $\rightarrow$  01 transition is also  $2(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda\mu dt$ . Also, for the multi-chromosome case, where we do not distinguish between a 10 and a 01 pair, the probability of a 11  $\rightarrow$  10 transition is simply the sum of the 11  $\rightarrow$  10 and 11  $\rightarrow$  01 transitions computed using the two-chromosome model, which is  $4(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda\mu dt$ .

It should be noted that the assumption that  $\mu$  is fixed as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , implies that  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , which allowed us to work to first order in  $\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon'$  when computing the various transition probabilities. In particular, the 11  $\rightarrow$  00 transition is not allowed, since it is second-order in  $\epsilon$  and may be neglected.

We now consider the case of a 10 pair. Here, the analysis is the same for both the two-chromosome and multi-chromosome models: First of all, because  $\mu = N\epsilon = NL_G\epsilon'$  is held fixed as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , it may be assumed that a gene with a fixed mutation has a mutation at only one base pair, since the probability of two mutations occurring at two different locations in the same gene in an infinite genome is negligible. Furthermore, because, in the two-chromosome case, there are  $l_{10} + l_{01}$  homologous gene pairs with one functional and one non-functional copy of a given gene, and, in the multi-chromosome case, there are  $l_{10}$  homologous gene pairs with one functional and one non-functional copy of a given gene, then, in an infinite genome, the probability that mutations occur during daughter strand synthesis in homologous recombination repair of the 10/01 gene pairs is 0. This means that for homologous gene pairs with one functional and one non-functional copy of a given gene, we may assume that homologous recombination repair does not generate any new mutations.

However, there is a probability that homologous recombination repair can eliminate the mutation in the 0 gene, or transfer the mutation in the 0 gene to the 1 gene. The former process leads to a 10  $\rightarrow$  11 transition, while the latter process leads to a 10  $\rightarrow$  00 transition.

Let us consider first the 10  $\rightarrow$  11 transition. For this transition to occur, the 0 gene must sustain double-stranded damage at a specific base-pair, and then homologous recombination repair must lead to the elimination of the mutation. To compute the probability that the mutation is eliminated, let us suppose that the double-stranded damage is at base-pair  $i$ . Since the length of the strand involved in recombination repair is  $l_{HR}$ , the probability that the mutation is in the region covered by the strand is  $l_{HR}/L_G$ . Since the probability that the 0 gene sustains double-stranded damage during the time  $dt$  is  $\lambda dt$ , we obtain that the probability for the 10  $\rightarrow$  11 transition is given by  $(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda dt$ .

For the 10  $\rightarrow$  00 transition to occur, the 1 gene must sustain double-stranded damage at a specific base-pair, and then homologous recombination repair must lead to the elimination of the mutation. The mutation on the 0 gene must be contained in the strand that is used to repair the genetic damage on the 1 gene, which occurs with probability  $l_{HR}/L_G$ , and so the probability for the 10  $\rightarrow$  00 transition is given by  $(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda dt$ .

Finally, let us consider the case of a 00 homologous pair that sustains genetic damage. First of all, as with the 10 pairs, we may assume no new mutations are generated during the homologous recombination repair process. However, let us consider how a 00 pair may be generated in the first place: In the limit of infinite gene number limit, a 11 pair can only produce a 11 or 10 pair as a result of replication errors, since the probability of making two replication mistakes is second-order in  $\epsilon$  and therefore negligible. Furthermore, a 11 pair can only produce a 11 or 10 pair as a result of homologous recombination repair. Because the number of 10 pairs is finite, in the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit we have that the 1 parent in a 10 pair produces two 1 daughters, and the 0 parent produces two 0 daughters (i.e. new mutations are produced in the 11 pairs). Therefore, a 00 pair can only be generated if the two 0 daughters co-segregate. However, since the two 0 daughters are both the daughters of the same 0 parent, and because we assume that no new mutations are generated in these daughters, then the two daughters are both clones of the original 0 parent and therefore have the same fixed mutation at the same base-pair.

Another mechanism by which a 00 pair is produced is via the 10  $\rightarrow$  00 transition. Here, the 0 gene transfers its mutation to the 1 gene, resulting in a clonal pair.

Note then that the 00 homologous pairs in this model are clonal pairs, and so homologous recombination repair has no effect on these pairs, i.e. they remain 00.

If we absorb the  $(l_{HR}/L_G)$  term into  $\lambda$ , and so re-define  $(l_{HR}/L_G)\lambda$  as  $\lambda$ , then we obtain a per genome, first-order rate constant of  $2\lambda\mu$  for a 11  $\rightarrow$  10 and a 11  $\rightarrow$  01 transition. We also obtain a per genome, first-order rate con-




FIG. 4: Illustration of the various co-segregation patterns and associated probabilities. The probability that the daughter chromosomes of a given parent co-segregate into the same daughter cell is  $r_i$ , so that  $1 - r_i$  is the probability that the daughter chromosome of a given parent co-segregate with a daughter of the other parent.

stant of  $\lambda l_{10}$  for a  $10 \rightarrow 11$  and a  $10 \rightarrow 00$  transition, while we obtain a per genome, first-order rate constant of  $\lambda l_{01}$  for a  $01 \rightarrow 11$  and a  $01 \rightarrow 00$  transition (this analysis is for the two-chromosome genome. For the multi-chromosome genome, there is no distinction between the 10 and 01 homologous pairs, so that the corresponding rate constants are simply added together).

These rate constants will be incorporated into the evolutionary dynamics equations for the various replication pathways that will be considered in the following subsections.

#### D. Asexual replication

##### 1. Two-chromosomed genome

For asexual replication, we assume that each parent chromosome replicates, and the four resulting daughter chromosomes segregate into the two daughter cells, where each daughter receives two chromosomes. We allow for mitotic recombination, so that there is a probability  $r_i$  that two daughter chromosomes derives from the same parent will co-segregate into the same daughter cell. This means that there is a probability  $1 - r_i$  that a daughter chromosome co-segregates with a daughter chromosome derived from the other parent chromosome. Figure 4 illustrates the various co-segregation pathways and their associated probabilities.

By the symmetry of the fitness landscape, we may assume that the value of  $n_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}$  for a given ordered strand-pair only depends on the values of  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ . If we define  $n_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}}$  to be the population of all ordered strand-

pairs characterized by  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ , then we may define  $z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}} = n_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}}/n$ , where  $n$  is the total population of organisms (which is equal to the total population of ordered strand-pairs).

In the limit of infinite gene number, i.e. as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , if we assume that  $\mu$  is held constant (which is equivalent to fixing the per genome replication fidelity in the limit of infinite genome size), we obtain that the evolutionary dynamics of the population is governed by the following system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2, l_3}}{dt} = & -(\alpha^{l_3} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \\ & + 2e^{-2\mu} \left[ r_i \frac{\mu^{l_1+l_2}}{l_1! l_2!} \sum_{l'=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l''=0}^{l_3} \alpha^{l'} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3-l'-l''} \right. \\ & \left. + (1-r_i) \alpha^{l_3} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \frac{\mu^{l_1-l'_1+l_2-l'_2}}{(l_1-l'_1)!(l_2-l'_2)!} z_{l'_1, l'_2, l_3} \right] \\ & - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \\ & + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, l_3} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, l_3} \\ & + \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3} \\ & + \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3-1} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3-1} \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced an additional term,  $\bar{\kappa}(t)$ , defined as  $(1/n)(dn/dt) = \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_3=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3}$ . This quantity is termed the *mean fitness* of the population.

The above system of equations is derived in the Materials and Methods section, though the derivation does not include the effect of homologous recombination repair. Homologous recombination repair is then incorporated via the prescription provided in the previous subsection.

It should be noted that homologous recombination leads to an additional first-order decay term that increases linearly with the value of  $l_{10} + l_{01}$ . This means that, for a given value of  $\lambda > 0$ , the population will not steadily accumulate mutations, which may be expected because the fitness is unaffected as long as each homologous pair has a least one functional gene. Rather, once the number of homologous gene pairs with one functional and one non-functional gene becomes sufficiently large, the rate of decay to 00 and 11 gene pairs becomes sufficiently large to prevent further accumulation of mutations. Furthermore, because the fitness decreases by a factor of  $\alpha$  for every 00 homologous pair in the genome, the population is also unable to accumulate mutations where both genes in a homologous pair are non-functional. Of course, the closer  $\lambda$  is to 0, then the average number of mutations per genome may increase as well (even to  $\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ ). However, for any positive value of  $\lambda$ , the average number of mutations will be finite, and so the various assumptions made in deriving the infinite genome equations are valid. For finite genomes, as long as the average number of mutations per genome is much smaller than  $N$ , then the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  analysis applies.

We are interested in the value of  $\bar{\kappa}(t)$  at mutation-selection balance. This value, we denote as  $\bar{\kappa}$ , represents



the long-term first-order growth rate constant of the population. In determining which reproduction strategy is advantageous in a given regime, we are interested in determining which strategy leads to the largest value of  $\bar{\kappa}$ , since the strategy with the largest value of  $\bar{\kappa}$  will drive the others to extinction. Thus, in this paper, we are working with what is known as a *group-selection approach*. While this approach is not appropriate in cases where individual fitnesses depend on the distribution of genotypes in the population (otherwise known as *frequency-dependent selection*) (Tannenbaum and Fontanari 2008), here, where we assume that the various populations with differing reproduction strategies do not interact with one another, the group-selection approach is a valid, if somewhat simplistic, analysis of the dynamics.

The mutation-selection balance is determined by setting the time derivatives to 0, giving,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\alpha^{l_3} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} = \\
& 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, l_3} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3-1} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3-1} \\
& + 2e^{-2\mu} [r_i \frac{\mu^{l_1+l_2}}{l_1! l_2!} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'=0}^{l_3} \alpha^{l'} z_{l, l_3-l', l'} \\
& + (1 - r_i) \alpha^{l_3} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \frac{\mu^{l_1-l'_1+l_2-l'_2}}{(l_1-l'_1)!(l_2-l'_2)!} z_{l'_1, l'_2, l_3}] \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

To solve this system of equations for  $\bar{\kappa}$ , we define a function  $w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_3=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{l_1} \beta_2^{l_2} \beta_3^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3}$ , where  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in [0, 1]$ . Multiplying both sides of the steady-state equations by  $\beta_1^{l_1} \beta_2^{l_2} \beta_3^{l_3}$  and summing  $l_1, l_2, l_3$  from 0 to  $\infty$  we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\bar{\kappa} + 2\lambda\mu(2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2))w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) + w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \alpha\beta_3) \\
& + \lambda(2\beta_1 - 1 - \beta_3) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} + \lambda(2\beta_2 - 1 - \beta_3) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_2} = \\
& 2e^{-(2-\beta_1-\beta_2)\mu} [r_i w(1, \beta_3, \alpha\beta_3) + (1 - r_i)w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \alpha\beta_3)] \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider first the case where  $r_i = 0$ . Then, setting  $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$ , and  $\beta_3 = 2\beta - 1$  for  $\beta \in [1/2, 1]$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1 - \beta))w(\beta, \beta, 2\beta - 1) + w(\beta, \beta, \alpha(2\beta - 1)) \\
& = 2e^{-2(1-\beta)\mu} w(\beta, \beta, \alpha(2\beta - 1)) \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\kappa} &= (2e^{-2(1-\beta)\mu} - 1) \frac{w(\beta, \beta, \alpha(2\beta - 1))}{w(\beta, \beta, 2\beta - 1)} - 4\lambda\mu(1 - \beta) \\
&\leq 2e^{-2(1-\beta)\mu} - 1 - 4\lambda\mu(1 - \beta) \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, as long as  $\beta > 1/2$  we can divide by  $w(\beta, \beta, 2\beta - 1)$ . The reason for this is that, as long as

the population is localized to a finite number of mutations, then some  $z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} > 0$ , which then implies that  $w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) > 0$  for  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 > 0$ .

Since the inequality above holds for all  $\beta \in (1/2, 1]$ , it follows that  $\bar{\kappa} \leq 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ . If the steady-state population distribution is such that there exist  $z_{l_1, l_2, 0} > 0$ , then it follows that  $w(1/2, 1/2, 0) > 0$ , and so setting  $\beta \rightarrow 1/2$  we obtain  $\bar{\kappa} = 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ . Note that this increases to  $2e^{-\mu} - 1$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .

Let us now consider the case where  $r_i = 1$ . Then, setting  $\beta_1 = 1, \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$  in the limit that  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain,

$$(\bar{\kappa} + 1)w(1, 0, 0) = 2e^{-\mu}w(1, 0, 0) \quad (12)$$

Here, we are assuming that  $\partial w / \partial \beta_{1,2}$  converges to a finite value as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ . This assumption makes sense because any 10 or 01 homologous pair produces a 11 and a 00 homologous pair upon replication, since  $r_i = 1$ . This means that any 10 or 01 homologous pairs in the genome must be produced by mutation in the 11 homologous pairs. Since only a finite number of mutations occur during the cell cycle, the result is that, even if  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , there can be no unbounded accumulation of 10 or 01 homologous pairs in the population.

Now, when  $\mu = 0$ , we expect the population to consist entirely of the wild-type, so that  $z_{0,0,0} = 1$ . As  $\mu$  increases, we expect  $z_{0,0,0}$  to drop, however, if  $\mu$  is sufficiently small, then we nevertheless expect  $z_{0,0,0} > 0$ . This implies that  $w(1, 0, 0) > 0$ , from which we obtain that  $\bar{\kappa} = 2e^{-\mu} - 1$ .

If  $\bar{\kappa}$  varies monotonically from its  $r_i = 0$  to its  $r_i = 1$  values, then we obtain that, as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , the value of  $\bar{\kappa}$  approaches  $2e^{-\mu} - 1$  for all values of  $r_i$ . Of course, the analysis is only valid if  $2e^{-\mu} - 1 \geq 0$ . Once  $\mu$  exceeds  $\ln 2$  and  $2e^{-\mu} - 1 < 0$ , then, since  $\bar{\kappa} \geq 0$ , we must have that the value of  $\bar{\kappa}$  becomes 0, and the evolutionary dynamics of the population becomes characterized by a steady, if slowing, accumulation of mutations, a phenomenon termed the *error catastrophe*.

Figure 5 shows plots of the  $\bar{\kappa}$  versus  $\mu$  for various values of  $r_i$  and  $\lambda = 1, 0.1$  obtained by solving for the steady-state equations using fixed-point iteration. It can be seen that the values of  $\bar{\kappa}$  increase to  $2e^{-\mu} - 1$  for  $\mu < \ln 2$ , and are then 0 afterwards.

## 2. Multi-chromosomed genome

The asexual replication pathway is identical to the one considered in the previous subsection, except that the individual homologous pairs segregate independently of one another. In the Materials and Methods section, we show that the evolutionary dynamics equations are given




FIG. 5: Plot of  $\bar{\kappa}$  versus  $\mu$  for asexual replication in the two-chromosomal genome. We took  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 0.1, 1$ . While the graphs only show the  $r_i = 0$  curves, for all values of  $r_i$  that we considered, we obtained the same result of  $\bar{\kappa} = 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ .

by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa}(t = \infty))z_{l_1, l_2} + 2e^{-2\mu} \times \\ &\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \alpha^{l'_2} z_{l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2, l'_2} \frac{(l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2)!}{l!l'_1!(l_2-l'_2)!} \times \\ &\left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} (1-r_i)^{l'_1} \frac{(2\mu)^{l_1-l'_1}}{(l_1-l'_1)!} \\ &- (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2} + 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} \\ &+ \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $z_{l_1, l_2}$  is defined as the fraction of the population with genomes consisting of  $l_1$  homologous pairs with one functional and one non-functional copy of a given gene, and  $l_2$  homologous pairs with two non-functional pairs of the given gene. As with the two-chromosomal model, the derivation in the Materials and Methods section does not include the effect of homologous recombination repair. However, this is added according to the prescription described earlier.

The steady-state for this model is defined by the system of equations,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2} = \\ &4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \\ &2e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \alpha^{l'_2} z_{l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2, l'_2} \frac{(l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2)!}{l!l'_1!(l_2-l'_2)!} \times \\ &\left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} (1-r_i)^{l'_1} \frac{(2\mu)^{l_1-l'_1}}{(l_1-l'_1)!} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Proceeding analogously to the two-chromosome case, we define  $w(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{l_1} \beta_2^{l_2} z_{l_1, l_2}$  for

$\beta_1, \beta_2 \in [0, 1]$ . We then obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1-\beta_1))w(\beta_1, \beta_2) + w(\beta_1, \alpha\beta_2) \\ &+ \lambda(2\beta_1 - 1 - \beta_2) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} = \\ &2e^{-2\mu(1-\beta_1)} w(\beta_1(1-r_i) + \frac{1+\beta_2}{2} r_i, \alpha\beta_2) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Define  $\beta = \beta_1$ , and for  $\beta \geq 1/2$ , set  $\beta_2 = 2\beta - 1$ , to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1-\beta))w(\beta, 2\beta-1) + w(\beta, \alpha(2\beta-1)) \\ &= 2e^{-2\mu(1-\beta)} w(\beta, \alpha(2\beta-1)) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\kappa} &= (2e^{-2\mu(1-\beta)} - 1) \frac{w(\beta, \alpha(2\beta-1))}{w(\beta, 2\beta-1)} - 4\lambda\mu(1-\beta) \\ &\leq 2e^{-2\mu(1-\beta)} - 1 - 4\lambda\mu(1-\beta) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Since this inequality must hold for all  $\beta \in [1/2, 1]$ , it follows that  $\bar{\kappa} \leq 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ . However, if  $\mu$  is sufficiently small so that  $z_{0,0} > 0$ , then  $w(1/2, 0) > 0$  for  $\mu$  sufficiently small. Therefore, for such  $\mu$ , taking the limit as  $\beta \rightarrow 1/2$  gives  $\bar{\kappa} = 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ , independently of the value of  $r_i$ .

Using fixed-point iteration, we have found that  $\bar{\kappa} = \max\{2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu, 0\}$  for  $\alpha = 0.5$  and for  $\lambda = 0.1$  for various values of  $r_i$ . Because this function has already been plotted in Figure 5 showing the numerical results for the two-chromosome case, we do not plot the results for the multi-chromosome case. As with the two-chromosome case, the population undergoes a localization to delocalization transition at a critical value of  $\mu$  that is  $\leq \ln 2$ , corresponding to the error catastrophe.

## E. Self-fertilization with random mating

In this subsection, we consider what we term the self-fertilization reproduction pathway. Here, a mature diploid divides into two diploids, each of which then divide into two haploids, producing four haploids. These haploids then fuse with one another at random to produce two daughter diploid cells.

### 1. Two-chromosomal genome

For the two-chromosomal genome, the equations for self-fertilization are identical to the equations for asexual replication, where  $r_i = 1/3$ . The reason for this is that a given parent diploid cell produces four haploids containing four chromosomes. Because mating is random, a given chromosome has a probability of 1/3 of pairing with any other chromosome, which gives  $r_i = 1/3$ .

## 2. Multi-chromosomed genome

In the Materials and Methods, we show that, for the multi-chromosomed genome, the evolutionary dynamics equations for self-fertilization with random mating are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2}}{dt} = & -(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_1, l_2} + \frac{2}{3}e^{-2\mu} \times \\ & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \alpha^{l'_2} z_{l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2, l'_2} \times \\ & \frac{(l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2)! (2\mu)^{l_1-l'_1}}{l!l'_1!(l_2-l'_2)! (l_1-l'_1)!} \times \\ & \left[ \left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} (1-r_i)^{l'_1} + 2\left(\frac{1-r_i}{4}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} \left(\frac{1+r_i}{2}\right)^{l'_1} \right] \\ & - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2} + 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} \\ & + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The steady-state equations are then given by,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2} = \\ & 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \\ & + \frac{2}{3}e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \alpha^{l'_2} z_{l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2, l'_2} \times \\ & \frac{(l+l'_1+l_2-l'_2)! (2\mu)^{l_1-l'_1}}{l!l'_1!(l_2-l'_2)! (l_1-l'_1)!} \times \\ & \left[ \left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} (1-r_i)^{l'_1} + 2\left(\frac{1-r_i}{4}\right)^{l+l_2-l'_2} \left(\frac{1+r_i}{2}\right)^{l'_1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and so we obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1-\beta_1))w(\beta_1, \beta_2) + w(\beta_1, \alpha\beta_2) \\ & + \lambda(2\beta_1 - 1 - \beta_2) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} = \frac{2}{3}e^{-2(1-\beta_1)\mu} \times \\ & \left[ w(\beta_1(1-r_i) + \frac{1+\beta_2}{2}r_i, \alpha\beta_2) \right. \\ & \left. + 2w(\beta_1 \frac{1+r_i}{2} + \frac{1+\beta_2}{2} \frac{1-r_i}{2}, \alpha\beta_2) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

For sufficiently small  $\mu$  we expect that  $w(1/2, 0)$  will be positive at steady-state. Assuming then that  $\mu$  is sufficiently small that  $w(1/2, 0) > 0$  is positive, we set  $\beta_1 = 1/2$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0$ , to obtain,

$$(\bar{\kappa} + 2\lambda\mu + 1)w\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) = 2e^{-\mu}w\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \quad (21)$$

and so  $\bar{\kappa} = 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ . From fixed-point iteration simulations using  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 0.1$ , we obtain that  $\bar{\kappa} = \max\{2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu, 0\}$ . We do not show results of these simulations, since the graphs look identical to the  $\lambda = 0.1$  curve in Figure 5.

## F. Sexual reproduction with random mating

With the sexual reproduction pathway, we assume that a mature diploid divides into four haploids, which then enter a haploid pool. The haploids fuse with one another at random to produce daughter diploids, which then grow to maturity and begin the cycle again.

We assume that haploid fusion is a second-order process characterized by a rate constant  $\gamma$ . We let the system volume be denoted by  $V$ .  $n_D$  denotes the population of diploids,  $n_H$  denotes the population of haploids, and we define the total population  $n = n_D + n_H/2$ . We then define a population density  $\rho = n/V$ , and we assume that, as  $n$  increases, the system volume increases so as to maintain a constant value of  $\rho$ .

For the two-chromosomed genome, the diploid ordered strand-pairs are characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ , while for the multi-chromosomed genome, the diploids are characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{00}$ . However, in both cases, the haploids are characterized by the parameter  $l_0$ , which denotes the number of positions where the corresponding gene is 0, i.e. non-functional.

### 1. Two-chromosomed genome

In the Materials and Methods, we show that the evolutionary dynamics equations are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2, 0}}{dt} = & -(1 + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_1, l_2, 0} + 2\gamma\rho z_{l_1} z_{l_2} \\ & - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, 0} \\ & + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, 0} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, 0} \\ & + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, 0} + \lambda(l_2+1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, 0} \\ \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2, l_3 > 0}}{dt} = & -(\alpha^{l_3} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \\ & - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \\ & + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, l_3} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, l_3} \\ & + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3} + \lambda(l_2+1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3} \\ & + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3-1} + \lambda(l_2+1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3-1} \\ \frac{dz_l}{dt} = & -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_l - 2\gamma\rho z_l z_H \\ & + 2e^{-\mu} \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} = n_{l_1, l_2, l_3}/n$ , and  $z_l = n_l/(2n)$ , where  $n_l$  denotes the number of haploids with  $l$  non-functional genes. The mean fitness is defined as usual by  $\bar{\kappa}(t) = (1/n)(dn/dt) = \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_3=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3}$ .

The steady-state equations are then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, 0} = \\
& 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, 0} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, 0} \\
& + \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, 0} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, 0} \\
& + 2\gamma\rho z_{l_1, l_2} \\
& (\alpha^{l_3} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3 > 0} = \\
& 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, l_3} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3-1} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3-1} \\
& \bar{\kappa}z_l + 2\gamma\rho z_l z_H = 2e^{-\mu} \times \\
& \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \quad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, in the limit when haploid fusion may be taken to be instantaneous, which occurs when  $\gamma\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that  $z_l \rightarrow 0$  for all  $l$ . However, defining  $\tilde{z}_l = z_l/z_H$ , we have, by summing  $l$  from 0 to  $\infty$  in the steady-state equation for the haploids, that,

$$\gamma\rho z_H^2 = \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_3=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} = \bar{\kappa} \quad (24)$$

which implies that,

$$\tilde{z}_l = \frac{e^{-\mu}}{\bar{\kappa}} \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \quad (25)$$

This gives us the following steady-state equations in the limit that  $\gamma\rho \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\kappa}(1 + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, 0} = \\
& 2\bar{\kappa}\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, 0} + 2\bar{\kappa}\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, 0} \\
& \bar{\kappa}\lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, 0} + \bar{\kappa}\lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, 0} + 2e^{-2\mu} \times \\
& \left[ \sum_{l'_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_1} \sum_{l'_3=0}^{l_1-l'_2} \alpha^{l'_3} z_{l'_1, l'_2, l'_3} \frac{\mu^{l_1-l'_2-l'_3}}{(l_1-l'_2-l'_3)!} \right] \times \\
& \left[ \sum_{l'_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l'_2=0}^{l_2} \sum_{l'_3=0}^{l_2-l'_2} \alpha^{l'_3} z_{l'_1, l'_2, l'_3} \frac{\mu^{l_2-l'_2-l'_3}}{(l_2-l'_2-l'_3)!} \right] \\
& (\alpha^{l_3} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda(l_1 + l_2))z_{l_1, l_2, l_3 > 0} = \\
& 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2, l_3} + 2\lambda\mu z_{l_1, l_2-1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2, l_3-1} + \lambda(l_2 + 1)z_{l_1, l_2+1, l_3-1} \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first steady-state equation by  $\beta_1^{l_1} \beta_2^{l_2}$  and summing from  $l_1, l_2 = 0, \dots, \infty$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\kappa}(1 + \bar{\kappa} + 2\lambda\mu(2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2))w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0) \\
& + \bar{\kappa}\lambda[(2\beta_1 - 1)\frac{\partial w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)}{\partial \beta_1} + (2\beta_2 - 1)\frac{\partial w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)}{\partial \beta_2}] \\
& = 2e^{-(2-\beta_1-\beta_2)\mu} w(1, \beta_1, \alpha\beta_1) w(1, \beta_2, \alpha\beta_2) \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the second steady-state equation by  $\beta_1^{l_1} \beta_2^{l_2} \beta_3^{l_3}$  and summing from  $l_1, l_2 = 0, \dots, \infty$  and  $l_3 = 1, \dots, \infty$  we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\bar{\kappa} + 2\lambda\mu(2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)][w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) - w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)] \\
& + w(\beta_1, \beta_2, \alpha\beta_3) - w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0) \\
& + \lambda[(2\beta_1 - 1)(\frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} - \frac{\partial w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)}{\partial \beta_1}) \\
& + (2\beta_2 - 1)(\frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_2} - \frac{\partial w(\beta_1, \beta_2, 0)}{\partial \beta_2})] \\
& - \lambda\beta_3(\frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_2}) = 0 \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, noting that  $\bar{\kappa} = w(1, 1, \alpha)$ , and setting  $\beta_1 = 1, \beta_2 = 0$  gives, from the first equation, that,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu - \bar{\kappa})w(1, 0, 0) = \\
& \lambda(z_{0,1,0} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (lz_{l,0,0} - z_{l,1,0})) \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that it is not possible to solve for  $\bar{\kappa}$  based on this equation, since we do not know the sign of  $z_{0,1,0} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (lz_{l,0,0} - z_{l,1,0})$ . If this quantity is positive, then if  $\mu$  is sufficiently small that  $w(1, 0, 0) > 0$  we have  $\bar{\kappa} < 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ , while if this quantity is negative, then if  $\mu$  is sufficiently small that  $w(1, 0, 0) > 0$  we have  $\bar{\kappa} > 2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu$ .

We will provide plots of  $\bar{\kappa}$  versus  $\mu$  obtained using fixed-point iteration after we present the results for the multi-chromosomed genome.

## 2. Multi-chromosomed genome

In the Materials and Methods section, the evolutionary dynamics equations for sexual replication with random mating for the multi-chromosomed genome are shown to be,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{dz_{l,0}}{dt} = -(1 + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l,0} + 2\gamma\rho \sum_{l'=0}^l z_{l', l-l'} \\
& - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l)z_{l,0} + 4\lambda\mu z_{l-1,0} \\
& \lambda(l+1)z_{l+1,0} \\
& \frac{dz_{l_1, l_2 > 0}}{dt} = -(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_1, l_2} \\
& - (4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2} + 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} \\
& \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1 + 1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \\
& \frac{dz_l}{dt} = -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_l - 2\gamma\rho z_l z_H + 2e^{-\mu} \times \\
& \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \frac{(l_1 + l_2)!}{l_1! l_2!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_1+l_2} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

The steady-state equations are then,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l)z_{l,0} &= 4\lambda\mu z_{l-1,0} + \lambda(l+1)z_{l+1,0} \\
+ 2\gamma\rho \sum_{l'=0}^l z_{l'} z_{l-l'} \\
(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2 > 0} &= 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} \\
+ \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1} \\
\bar{\kappa}z_l + 2\gamma\rho z_H z_l &= 2e^{-\mu} \times \\
\sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1+l_2, l_3} \frac{(l_1+l_2)!}{l_1! l_2!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_1+l_2} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!}
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In the limit where  $\gamma\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that  $z_l \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, summing the last equation from  $l = 0$  to  $\infty$  gives,

$$\gamma\rho z_H^2 = \bar{\kappa} \tag{32}$$

and so, defining  $\tilde{z}_l = z_l/z_H$  we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{z}_l &= \frac{e^{-\mu}}{\bar{\kappa}} \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^l \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1+l_2, l_3} \frac{(l_1+l_2)!}{l_1! l_2!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_1+l_2} \times \\
&\frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Substituting into the other steady-state equations gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\kappa}(1 + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l)z_{l,0} &= 4\bar{\kappa}\lambda\mu z_{l-1,0} + \bar{\kappa}\lambda(l+1)z_{l+1,0} \\
+ 2e^{-2\mu} \times \\
\sum_{l'=0}^l \left[ \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{l'} \sum_{l_3=0}^{l'-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1+l_2, l_3} \times \right. \\
&\left. \frac{(l_1+l_2)!}{l_1! l_2!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_1+l_2} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \right] \times \\
\left[ \sum_{l_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_2=0}^{l-l_1} \sum_{l_3=0}^{l-l_1-l_2} \alpha^{l_3} z_{l_1+l_2, l_3} \times \right. \\
&\left. \frac{(l_1+l_2)!}{l_1! l_2!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_1+l_2} \frac{\mu^{l-l_2-l_3}}{(l-l_2-l_3)!} \right] \\
(\alpha^{l_2} + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu + 2\lambda l_1)z_{l_1, l_2 > 0} &= 4\lambda\mu z_{l_1-1, l_2} \\
+ \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2} + \lambda(l_1+1)z_{l_1+1, l_2-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

We then have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\kappa}(1 + \bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1 - \beta))w(\beta, 0) + \bar{\kappa}\lambda(2\beta - 1) \frac{\partial w(\beta, 0)}{\partial \beta} &= \\
+ 2e^{-2(1-\beta)\mu} w\left(\frac{1+\beta}{2}, \alpha\beta\right)^2 \\
(\bar{\kappa} + 4\lambda\mu(1 - \beta_1))(w(\beta_1, \beta_2) - w(\beta_1, 0)) \\
+ w(\beta_1, \alpha\beta_2) - w(\beta_1, 0) \\
+ \lambda(2\beta_1 - 1 - \beta_2) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \beta_1} + \lambda(2\beta_1 - 1) \frac{\partial w(\beta_1, 0)}{\partial \beta_1} &= 0 \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$




FIG. 6: A plot of  $\bar{\kappa}$  versus  $\mu$  for the two sexual reproduction strategies for  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 0.1$ . The solid curve is a plot of  $\max\{2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu, 0\}$ , the dashed curve is the result for the multi-chromosomed strategy, and the dotted curve is the result for the two-chromosomed strategy.

Figure 6 shows a plot of  $\bar{\kappa}$  versus  $\mu$  for both the two-chromosome and multi-chromosome genome, where  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 0.1$ . The figure also compares the results with the analytical result of  $\bar{\kappa} = \max\{2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu, 0\}$ , obtained for the asexual and self-fertilization pathways. Note that the mean fitness of the sexual pathways is greater than the other reproduction pathways. While we do not provide additional figures here, it is important to note that the transition where  $\bar{\kappa}$  becomes 0 may be pushed to arbitrarily high values by taking  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ . This means that, when the homologous-recombination-repair-induced mutation rate is sufficiently low, and the organismal genomes contain numerous “non-essential” genes, then sexual reproduction can greatly delay the onset of genetic drift due to the error catastrophe.

It is also interesting to note that the mean fitness for sexual reproduction in the multi-chromosomed genome is lower than the mean fitness for the corresponding pathway in the two-chromosomed genome.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

This paper analyzed the evolutionary dynamics associated with three reproduction pathways in unicellular organisms: (1) Asexual reproduction, including mitotic recombination. (2) Self-fertilization with random mating. (3) Sexual reproduction with random mating. In addition, we considered two different forms of genome organization, to study the effects of recombination on the mean fitness for the various reproduction pathways: We considered a two-chromosomed genome, whereby the haploid complement of genes was all on a single chro-

mosome, and we also considered a multi-chromosomed genome, where each gene defined a separate chromosome, so that the distinct homologous pairs could segregate independently of one another.

We assumed that the purpose of diploidy is to provide genetic redundancy, in particular by allowing for the repair of genetic damage due to various mutagens, radiation, and environmental free radicals. As a result, we assumed that the process of homologous recombination repair gives rise to a first-order rate constant  $\lambda$  characterizing the rate at which repair either transmits a mutation from a non-functional gene to a functional gene, or the rate at which repair eliminates a mutation in a non-functional gene.

It was assumed that the fitness of a wild-type organism is 1, and that the fitness is unaffected as long as the organism has at least one functional copy of every gene. However, it was assumed each homologous pair without a functional copy of the given gene leads to a fitness penalty of  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

We found that, for both the asexual and self-fertilization pathways, that the mean fitness at mutation-selection balance converged to  $\max\{2e^{-\mu} - 1 - 2\lambda\mu, 0\}$ , where  $\mu$  is the average number of mutations per haploid complement of genes per replication cycle. This result holds independently of the extent of mitotic recombination or the organization of the genome (i.e. two-chromosomed or multi-chromosomed). However, for the sexual reproduction pathways, we found that, if  $\lambda$  is sufficiently small, then the mean fitness at mutation-selection balance exceeds the mean fitness of the other reproduction pathways. More importantly, the onset of the error catastrophe is delayed in the sexual pathways, and the error catastrophe may be pushed to arbitrarily high values of  $\mu$  by making  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ . Although this result was obtained for unicellular organisms, it nevertheless suggests a reason why sexual reproduction is ubiquitous in more complex, multicellular organisms. For such organisms,  $\mu$  is sufficiently high that sex is necessary to prevent the accumulation of mutations due to genetic drift. That is, without sex, complex multicellular organisms would eventually die out. This of course does not explain why a large variety of sexual and mixed asexual-sexual strategies are observed (e.g. male-female body size, the sex ratio, male parental care versus lack thereof, sperm storage, etc.). While these complex issues are left for future work, the models presented in this paper nevertheless suggest a basic advantage for sexual reproduction that is at work in slowly replicating, complex diploid organisms. The specific form that the sexual strategies take may then depend on other parameters that are connected to the specific environmental niche that the given species inhabit, and the particular survival strategy that is employed.

It should be noted that the results for the sexual reproduction pathways were obtained in the limit where  $\gamma\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , that is, where the time cost for sex may be assumed to be negligible. For finite values of  $\gamma\rho$  the value

of  $\bar{\kappa}$  will be reduced. This suggests why unicellular organisms such as *S. cerevisiae* engage in a sexual stress response. When conditions are such that the fitness is high, then the relative value of  $\gamma\rho$  is small, i.e., the characteristic time a haploid spends search for a mate with which to fuse is large compared to the characteristic doubling time, and so the fitness benefit of sex does not outweigh its cost. However, under stressful conditions, the fitness may drop to values where the characteristic haploid fusion time is small compared to the characteristic doubling time, and so the fitness benefit for sex outweighs the costs (for more complex, slowly replicating organisms, it is possible that the cost for sex is almost always sufficiently small to keep sex the optimal strategy. This, however, is highly species-dependent, since many classes of organisms are able to reproduce both asexually and sexually).

An interesting feature of meiosis, the process by which a diploid cell produces four haploids, is that the first diploid division is essentially characterized by  $r_i = 1$ , using the notation of this paper. The reason for this is that, during the first stage of meiosis, a given chromosome replicates, and the two daughter chromosomes remain paired together. The two homologous pairs of daughters then line up with one another, during which recombination can occur, after which each pair of daughter chromosomes segregate into distinct cells. We offer the following simple explanation for this segregation mechanism: If the homologous pairs of daughters line up in the first stage of meiosis, then, in the second stage, where haploid production takes place, the homologous pairs no longer need to find each other, since they are already connected. Thus, this haploid production pathway only requires each homologous pair of chromosomes to line up with one another in the original parent diploid cell. If the daughters of a given parent were not to co-segregate, then each homologous pair would have to find one another in each of the two daughter diploids, in order to properly form four haploid cells with the haploid complement of genes. This second pathway requires twice the number of homologous pair alignments, which takes additional time and energy over the first pathway.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the two-chromosomed genome gives a somewhat higher mean fitness than the multi-chromosomed genome in the sexual reproduction pathways, whereas no fitness difference is obtained from the other pathways. This would seem to contradict the observation that meiotic recombination amongst chromosomes occurs during the first phase of meiosis. While this is certainly a subject for further investigation, we nevertheless offer two possible (and not necessarily mutually contradictory) explanations for this phenomenon: First of all, just as sister chromatid exchange occurs during the normal mitotic division in asexual reproduction, it is possible that meiotic recombination arises due to the close proximity of homologous molecules of DNA. The recombination process may emerge due to the chemical properties of the DNA

molecule itself (i.e. natural entangling between homologous regions that the cell needs to deal with, which results in some swapping of genes), and so, in a static environment, recombination is a process that the cell may wish to control and minimize.

Another possibility is that recombination does not provide a selective advantage in static environments, but it may provide a selective advantage in a dynamic environment. Thus, while this paper has identified a selective advantage for sexual reproduction in static environments, sex may also provide an advantage in dynamic environments that is enhanced with meiotic recombination. One way to test whether this explanation is correct is to determine whether cells can control their rates of meiotic recombination, in particular to test whether meiotic recombination rates increase under more stressful environments.

#### IV. MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this section, we derive the evolutionary dynamics equations for the various reproduction pathways. We derive the equations without homologous recombination repair, as this effect may be added in a straightforward manner according to the prescription given in the paper.

##### A. Derivation details for the asexual reproduction pathway

###### 1. Two-chromosome genome

The dynamical equations governing the evolution of the asexually replicating, two-chromosomed unicellular population, are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} n_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} \\
&+ \sum_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \kappa_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} n_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \times \\
&\sum_{\sigma'_{11}} \sum_{\sigma'_{12}} \sum_{\sigma'_{21}} \sum_{\sigma'_{22}} p(\sigma'_{11}, \sigma'_{12}) p(\sigma'_{11}, \sigma'_{21}) p(\sigma'_{21}, \sigma'_{22}) p(\sigma'_{21}, \sigma'_{22}) \times \\
&[r_i (\delta_{\{\sigma'_{11}, \sigma'_{12}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} + \delta_{\{\sigma'_{21}, \sigma'_{22}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} (1 - r_i) (\delta_{\{\sigma'_{11}, \sigma'_{21}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} + \delta_{\{\sigma'_{12}, \sigma'_{22}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} (1 - r_i) (\delta_{\{\sigma'_{11}, \sigma'_{22}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} + \delta_{\{\sigma'_{12}, \sigma'_{21}\}, \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}})] \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}, \{\sigma_3, \sigma_4\}} = 1$  if  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} = \{\sigma_3, \sigma_4\}$ , and 0 otherwise.

The above equation may be expanded into separate

terms, which may then be collected and simplified to give,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} n_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} \\
&+ r_i \sum_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \kappa_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} n_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \times \\
&\sum_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2), \{\sigma''_1, \sigma''_2\} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} [p(\sigma'_1, \sigma''_1) p(\sigma'_1, \sigma''_2) \\
&+ p(\sigma'_2, \sigma''_1) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma''_2)] \\
&+ 2(1 - r_i) \sum_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \kappa_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} n_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}} \times \\
&\sum_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2), \{\sigma''_1, \sigma''_2\} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}} p(\sigma'_1, \sigma''_1) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma''_2) \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

Converting to the ordered strand-pair representation we have, for  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} n_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}, \sigma'_1 \neq \sigma'_2} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} n_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} \times \\
&[p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_1) p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_2) + p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_1) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_2)] \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{\{\sigma', \sigma'\}} \kappa_{(\sigma', \sigma')} n_{(\sigma', \sigma')} p(\sigma', \sigma_1) p(\sigma', \sigma_2) \\
&+ 2(1 - r_i) \sum_{\{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2\}, \sigma'_1 \neq \sigma'_2} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} n_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} \times \\
&[p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_1) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_2) + p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_2) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_1)] \\
&+ 2(1 - r_i) \sum_{\{\sigma', \sigma'\}} \kappa_{(\sigma', \sigma')} n_{(\sigma', \sigma')} p(\sigma', \sigma_1) p(\sigma', \sigma_2) \\
&= -\kappa_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} n_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} n_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_1) p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_2) \\
&+ 2(1 - r_i) \sum_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} n_{(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)} p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_1) p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_2) \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

We also have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{(\sigma,\sigma)}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{(\sigma,\sigma)}n_{(\sigma,\sigma)} \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{\{\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2\},\sigma'_1 \neq \sigma'_2} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}n_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \\
&[p(\sigma'_1,\sigma)p(\sigma'_1,\sigma) + p(\sigma'_2,\sigma)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma)] \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{\{\sigma',\sigma'\}} \kappa_{(\sigma',\sigma')}n_{(\sigma',\sigma')}p(\sigma',\sigma)p(\sigma',\sigma) \\
&+ 2(1-r_i) \sum_{\{\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2\},\sigma'_1 \neq \sigma'_2} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}n_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \times \\
&[p(\sigma'_1,\sigma)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma) + p(\sigma'_1,\sigma)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma)] \\
&+ 2(1-r_i) \sum_{\{\sigma',\sigma'\}} \kappa_{(\sigma',\sigma')}n_{(\sigma',\sigma')}p(\sigma',\sigma)p(\sigma',\sigma) \\
&= -\kappa_{(\sigma,\sigma)}n_{(\sigma,\sigma)} \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}n_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}p(\sigma'_1,\sigma)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma) \\
&2(1-r_i) \sum_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}n_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}p(\sigma'_1,\sigma)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma)
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and so, converting from population numbers to population fractions, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dx_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}}{dt} &= -(\kappa_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} + \bar{\kappa}(t))x_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} \\
&+ 2r_i \sum_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}x_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}p(\sigma'_1,\sigma_1)p(\sigma'_1,\sigma_2) \\
&+ 2(1-r_i) \sum_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}x_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)}p(\sigma'_1,\sigma_1)p(\sigma'_2,\sigma_2)
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where  $x_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} \equiv n_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}/(n = \sum_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)} n_{(\sigma'_1,\sigma'_2)})$ , and  $\bar{\kappa}(t) = (1/n)(dn/dt) = \sum_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}x_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}$ .

To convert this to a set of equations in terms of the  $z_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}}$  population fractions, we proceed as follows: Given a daughter ordered strand-pair  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$  characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}$ , and given a parent ordered strand-pair  $(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2)$ , we let  $l_{i_1 i_2 j_1 j_2}$  denote the number of positions where  $\sigma_1$  is  $i_1$ ,  $\sigma_2$  is  $i_2$ ,  $\sigma'_1$  is  $j_1$ , and  $\sigma'_2$  is  $j_2$ . We then have,

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_1) &= p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{1011}+l_{1010}} \times \\
(1-p)^{l_{0111}+l_{0110}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} &\delta_{l_{1101}+l_{1100}+l_{1001}+l_{1000},0} \\
p(\sigma'_1, \sigma_2) &= p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{0111}+l_{0110}} \times \\
(1-p)^{l_{1011}+l_{1010}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} &\delta_{l_{1101}+l_{1100}+l_{0101}+l_{0100},0} \\
p(\sigma'_2, \sigma_2) &= p^{l_{1111}+l_{1101}+l_{0111}+l_{0101}} \times \\
(1-p)^{l_{1011}+l_{1001}+l_{0011}+l_{0001}} &\delta_{l_{1110}+l_{1100}+l_{0110}+l_{0100},0}
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Taking into account degeneracies, we then have,



$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}} + 2r_i \frac{N!}{l_{10}!l_{01}!l_{00}!(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00})!} \times \\
&\sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1101}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}} \sum_{l_{1100}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}-l_{1101}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{1001}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \sum_{l_{1000}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}-l_{1001}} \sum_{l_{0110}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0101}=0}^{l_{01}-l_{0110}} \sum_{l_{0100}=0}^{l_{01}-l_{0110}-l_{0101}} \\
&\sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010},l_{1101}+l_{1001}+l_{0101}+l_{0001},l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}}{l_{1101}+l_{1001}+l_{0101}+l_{0001}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}-l_{1101}-l_{1001}-l_{0101}-l_{0001}}{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}}} \times \\
&\binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}}{l_{1110}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}}{l_{1101}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}-l_{1101}}{l_{1100}} \times \\
&\binom{l_{10}}{l_{1010}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}}{l_{1001}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}-l_{1001}}{l_{1000}} \binom{l_{01}}{l_{0110}} \binom{l_{01}-l_{0110}}{l_{0101}} \binom{l_{01}-l_{0110}-l_{0101}}{l_{0100}} \times \\
&\binom{l_{00}}{l_{0010}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}}{l_{0001}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}}{l_{0000}} p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{1011}+l_{1010}} (1-p)^{l_{0111}+l_{0110}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1101}+l_{1100}+l_{1001}+l_{1000},0} \times \\
&p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{0111}+l_{0110}} (1-p)^{l_{0111}+l_{0110}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1101}+l_{1100}+l_{0101}+l_{0100},0} \\
&+ 2(1-r_i) \frac{N!}{l_{10}!l_{01}!l_{00}!(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00})!} \times \\
&\sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1101}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}} \sum_{l_{1100}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}-l_{1101}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{1001}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \sum_{l_{1000}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}-l_{1001}} \sum_{l_{0110}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0101}=0}^{l_{01}-l_{0110}} \sum_{l_{0100}=0}^{l_{01}-l_{0110}-l_{0101}} \\
&\sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010},l_{1101}+l_{1001}+l_{0101}+l_{0001},l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}}{l_{1101}+l_{1001}+l_{0101}+l_{0001}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}-l_{1101}-l_{1001}-l_{0101}-l_{0001}}{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0100}+l_{0000}}} \times \\
&\binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}}{l_{1110}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}}{l_{1101}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}-l_{1101}}{l_{1100}} \times \\
&\binom{l_{10}}{l_{1010}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}}{l_{1001}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}-l_{1001}}{l_{1000}} \binom{l_{01}}{l_{0110}} \binom{l_{01}-l_{0110}}{l_{0101}} \binom{l_{01}-l_{0110}-l_{0101}}{l_{0100}} \times \\
&\binom{l_{00}}{l_{0010}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}}{l_{0001}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}}{l_{0000}} p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{1011}+l_{1010}} (1-p)^{l_{0111}+l_{0110}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1101}+l_{1100}+l_{1001}+l_{1000},0} \times \\
&p^{l_{1111}+l_{1110}+l_{0111}+l_{0110}} (1-p)^{l_{0111}+l_{0110}+l_{0011}+l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1110}+l_{1100}+l_{0110}+l_{0100},0} \\
&= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}} + 2r_i \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0110}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} \times \\
&z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010},l_{0001},l_{0000}} \frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}!l_{1010}!l_{0110}!l_{0010}!} \frac{1}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!} \frac{1}{(l_{01}-l_{0110})!} \frac{1}{(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!} \times \\
&\frac{(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110}+l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!}{(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}-l_{1110})!} p^{2(N-l_{00})-l_{10}-l_{01}} \times \\
&\epsilon^{l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}} \epsilon^{l_{00}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}} \\
&+ 2(1-r_i) \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0101}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1010}+l_{0010},l_{0101}+l_{0001},l_{0000}} \frac{(l_{1010}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1010}!l_{0010}!} \frac{(l_{0101}+l_{0001})!}{l_{0101}!l_{0001}!} \times \\
&\frac{1}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!} \frac{1}{(l_{01}-l_{0101})!} \frac{1}{(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!} \times \\
&\frac{(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00}+l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0101}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!}{(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00})!} p^{2(N-l_{00})-l_{10}-l_{01}} \times \\
&\epsilon^{l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0101}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}} \epsilon^{l_{00}-l_{0000}}
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , this becomes,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}} \\
&+ 2e^{-2\mu} [r_i \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0110}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010},l_{0001},l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{(l_{1110} + l_{1010} + l_{0110} + l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}!l_{1010}!l_{0110}!l_{0010}!} \frac{\mu^{l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0110}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!(l_{01}-l_{0110})!(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!} \delta_{l_{00}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}+l_{1010}+l_{0110}+l_{0010},0} \\
&+ (1-r_i) \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0101}=0}^{l_{01}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0001}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1010}+l_{0010},l_{0101}+l_{0001},l_{0000}} \frac{(l_{1010} + l_{0010})!}{l_{1010}!l_{0010}!} \frac{(l_{0101} + l_{0001})!}{l_{0101}!l_{0001}!} \times \\
&\frac{\mu^{l_{10}+l_{01}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0101}-l_{0001}-l_{0000}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!(l_{01}-l_{0101})!(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0001}-l_{0000})!} \delta_{l_{00}-l_{0000},0} \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

Now,  $l_{00} - l_{0001} - l_{0000} + l_{1010} + l_{0110} + l_{0010} = 0$  implies that  $l_{1010} = l_{0110} = l_{0010} = 0$ , and  $l_{0001} + l_{0000} = l_{00}$ . Also,  $l_{00} - l_{0000} = 0$  implies that  $l_{00} = l_{0000}$ ,  $l_{0010} = l_{0001} = 0$ . As a result, our expression evaluates to,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{01},l_{00}} + 2e^{-2\mu} \times \\
&[r_i \frac{\mu^{l_{10}+l_{01}}}{l_{10}!l_{01}!} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110},l_{00}-l_{0000},l_{0000}} \\
&+ (1-r_i) \alpha^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0101}=0}^{l_{01}} z_{l_{1010},l_{0101},l_{00}} \times \\
&\frac{\mu^{l_{10}-l_{1010}+l_{01}-l_{0101}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!(l_{01}-l_{0101})!}] \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

## 2. Multi-chromosome genome

To derive the evolutionary dynamics equations for the multi-chromosome genomes replicating asexually, we label each of the daughter cells from a given parent as a ‘‘left’’ cell and a ‘‘right’’ cell. We then first wish to determine the probability that a given daughter cell, either left or right, has a particular genome. Since the homologous pairs segregate into the daughter cells independently of one another, we may compute the probability of a given segregation pattern for each homologous pair, and then multiply the appropriate probabilities together for a given daughter genome.

For this analysis, we will consider the left daughter cells only, since the arguments are analogous for the right daughter cells. Then, we wish to compute the probability  $p(rs \rightarrow xy)$ , where  $rs, xy = 11, 10, 00$ , which is the probability that a homologous pair where one gene is of type  $r$  and the other gene is of type  $s$  produces the homologous pair  $xy$  in the left daughter cell. We handle each case in turn:

11  $\rightarrow$  11: Since each daughter chromosome is the daugh-

ter of a 1 parent, the probability that a given daughter chromosome is 1 is  $p$ , so the probability that both are 1 is  $p^2$ .

11  $\rightarrow$  10: The probability that a given daughter chromosome is 1 is  $p$ , and the probability that a daughter chromosome is 0 is  $1-p$ . Since it does not matter which daughter is 1 and which is 0, we obtain an overall probability of  $2p(1-p)$ .

11  $\rightarrow$  00: The probability for this pathway is  $(1-p)^2$ .

10  $\rightarrow$  11: The 0 parent always forms two 0 daughters, while the 1 parent may form either a 11, 10, or a 00 daughter pair. In order to form a 11 daughter cell, the 1 parent must produce a 11 daughter pair, which occurs with probability  $p^2$ . Furthermore, the two 1 daughters must co-segregate. Since they are derived from the same parent, this occurs with probability  $r_i$ . Finally, the two co-segregating 1 daughters must co-segregate into the left cell, which occurs with probability of  $1/2$ . The overall probability is then  $r_i p^2 / 2$ .

10  $\rightarrow$  10: If the 1 parent forms two 1 daughters, then the two 1 daughters cannot co-segregate, for otherwise this would produce a 11 pair in one cell and a 00 pair in the other cell. So, we want each 1 to co-segregate with a 0 derived from the other parent gene, which occurs with probability  $1-r_i$ . The probability of this particular segregation pattern is  $(1-r_i)p^2$ .

The 1 parent forms one 1 and one 0 daughter with probability  $2p(1-p)$ . This produces a 10 pair in one cell, and a 00 pair in the other cell, so the probability that the left cell receives the 10 pair is  $1/2$ , giving an overall probability of  $p(1-p)$ .

Adding the probabilities together, we obtain an overall probability of  $p(1-r_i p)$ .

10  $\rightarrow$  00: The probability for this pathway is  $1-p(1-r_i p) - r_i p^2 / 2 = 1-p(1-r_i p + r_i p / 2) = 1-p(1-r_i p / 2)$ .

00  $\rightarrow$  00: The probability for this pathway is 1.

Given a daughter diploid characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{00}$ , and given a parent diploid, let  $l_{i_1 i_2 j_1 j_2}$  denote the number of homologous gene pairs where the daughter is  $i_1, i_2$  and the parent is  $j_1, j_2$ . The probability that the parent diploid produces the daughter diploid as the left daughter is,

$$p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1-p)]^{l_{1011}} (1-p)^{2l_{0011}} \times \left(\frac{r_i}{2} p^2\right)^{l_{1110}} [p(1-r_i p)]^{l_{1010}} \left[1 - p\left(1 - \frac{r_i}{2} p\right)\right]^{l_{0010}} \times \delta_{l_{1100}+l_{1000},0} \quad (45)$$

Taking into account degeneracies, we obtain that the evolutionary dynamics equations are then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t)) z_{l_{10},l_{00}} \\ &+ 2 \frac{N!}{l_{10}! l_{00}! (N-l_{10}-l_{00})!} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1100}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}} \alpha^{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}} \times \\ &\sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{1000}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}} \times \\ &\frac{z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010}, l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}}{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}}} \times \\ &\binom{N-l_{10}-l_{00}}{l_{1110}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}}{l_{1100}} \times \\ &\binom{l_{10}}{l_{1010}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}}{l_{1000}} \binom{l_{00}}{l_{0010}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}}{l_{0000}} \\ &p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1-p)]^{l_{1011}} (1-p)^{2l_{0011}} \times \\ &\left(\frac{r_i}{2} p^2\right)^{l_{1110}} [p(1-r_i p)]^{l_{1010}} \left[1 - p\left(1 - \frac{r_i}{2} p\right)\right]^{l_{0010}} \times \\ &\delta_{l_{1100}+l_{1000},0} \\ &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t)) z_{l_{10},l_{00}} \\ &+ 2 \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} \times \\ &z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010}, l_{0000}} \frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}! l_{1010}! l_{0010}!} \times \\ &\frac{1}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})! (l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!} \times \\ &\frac{1}{(N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}+l_{10}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!} \times \\ &\frac{1}{(N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110})!} \times \\ &p^{2(N-l_{00})-l_{10}} e^{l_{10}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0000}+l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000}} \times \\ &2^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l_{1110}} (1-r_i p)^{l_{1010}} \left[1 - p\left(1 - \frac{r_i}{2} p\right)\right]^{l_{0010}} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

In the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , this becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t)) z_{l_{10},l_{00}} \\ &+ 2e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} \times \\ &z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010}, l_{0000}} \frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}! l_{1010}! l_{0010}!} \times \\ &\frac{\mu^{l_{10}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0000}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})! (l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!} \times \\ &2^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l_{1110}} (1-r_i p)^{l_{1010}} \left[1 - p\left(1 - \frac{r_i}{2} p\right)\right]^{l_{0010}} \times \\ &\delta_{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000},0} \\ &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t)) z_{l_{10},l_{00}} \\ &2e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{00}-l_{0000}, l_{0000}} \times \\ &\frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{00}-l_{0000})! (2\mu)^{l_{10}-l_{1010}}}{l_{1110}! l_{1010}! (l_{00}-l_{0000})! (l_{10}-l_{1010})!} \times \\ &\left(\frac{r_i}{2}\right)^{l_{1110}+l_{00}-l_{0000}} (1-r_i)^{l_{1010}} \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

## B. Derivation Details for the Self-Fertilization Reproduction Pathway with Random Mating for the Multi-Chromosome Genome

To develop the evolutionary dynamics equations for self-fertilization with random mating, we proceed as follows: Given a parent diploid cell, we assume that it splits into a left diploid and a right diploid. The left diploid then splits into two haploids, haploid 1 on the left and haploid 2 on the right, while the right diploid also splits into two haploids, haploid 3 on the left and haploid 4 on the right.

We then have the following pairings, all with equal probability because of random mating: (1)  $1 \leftrightarrow 2, 3 \leftrightarrow 4$ . (2)  $1 \leftrightarrow 3, 2 \leftrightarrow 4$ . (3)  $1 \leftrightarrow 4, 2 \leftrightarrow 3$ . Each of the three possible pairing schemes have a probability of 1/3 of occurring.

We may consider each pairing scheme in turn. We begin with the first pairing scheme. Our goal is to determine, for a given parent diploid, what is the probability of obtaining a specific daughter diploid as the left daughter cell.

We consider the various probabilities in order.

1.  $1 \leftrightarrow 2, 3 \leftrightarrow 4$

11  $\rightarrow$  11: If a homologous pair in the parent diploid is 11, then each daughter gene in the final left diploid is the daughter of a 1 parent. Since the probability that a given daughter of a 1 parent is itself 1 is  $p$ , the probability that both daughters are 1 is  $p^2$ .

11 → 10: As with the previous case, the probability that a given daughter of a 1 parent is itself 1 is  $p$ , while the probability that the daughter is 0 is  $1 - p$ . Therefore, the probability that a given daughter of a 1 parent is 1 and the other daughter of a 1 parent is 0 is  $p(1 - p)$ . Since it does not matter which daughter is 1 and which is 0, we obtain a total probability of  $2p(1 - p)$ .

11 → 00: The probability of this pathway is  $1 - p^2 - 2p(1 - p) = (1 - p)^2$ .

10 → 11: The probability that a 10 pair produces 2 1 daughters and 2 0 daughters is  $p^2$ . Since these two 1 daughters are from the same 1 parent, the probability that they co-segregate into the left diploid is  $r_i/2$ , giving a total probability of  $r_i p^2/2$ .

10 → 10: The probability that a 10 pair produces 2 1 daughters and 2 0 daughters is  $p^2$ . Since these two 1 daughters are from the same 1 parent, and since the two 0 daughters are from the same 0 parent, the only way to obtain a 10 left daughter cell is for the daughter chromosomes of a given parent to not co-segregate. Since this occurs with probability  $1 - r_i$ , we obtain an overall probability of  $(1 - r_i)p^2$ .

The probability that a 10 pair produces 1 1 daughter and 3 0 daughters is  $2p(1 - p)$ . Since the probability that the 1 chromosome ends up in the left daughter cell is  $1/2$ , we obtain an overall probability of  $p(1 - p)$ .

The total probability is then  $(1 - r_i)p^2 + p(1 - p) = p(1 - r_i p)$ .

10 → 00: The probability for this pathway is  $1 - r_i p^2/2 - p(1 - r_i p) = 1 - p(1 - r_i p/2)$ .

00 → 00: Because of the neglect of backmutations, this occurs with probability 1.

### 2. $1 \leftrightarrow 3, 2 \leftrightarrow 4$

11 → 11, 10, 00: Following a similar line of reasoning to the one used above, we obtain an identical corresponding set of transition probabilities.

10 → 11: The 1 parent must produce two 1 daughters with probability  $p^2$ . These 1 daughters must segregate into distinct diploids, with a probability of  $1 - r_i$ . The probability that these 1 then end up in haploids 1 and 3 respectively is  $1/4$ , for a total probability of  $(1 - r_i)p^2/4$ .

10 → 10: The 1 parent produces two 1 daughters with probability  $p^2$ , while the 0 parent produces two 0 daughters with probability 1. If the 1 daughters and the 0 daughters each co-segregate, which occurs with probability  $r_i$ , then the 1 haploid and the 3 haploid will together

form a 10 pair. If the daughters of each parent do not co-segregate, with probability  $1 - r_i$ , then we form two 10 diploids. The probability that the 1 haploid has a 1 and the 3 haploid a 0 is  $1/4$ , and the probability that the 1 haploid has a 0 and the 3 haploid a 1 is  $1/4$ , giving an overall probability of  $p^2(r_i + (1 - r_i)/2) = (1 + r_i)p^2/2$ .

The 1 parent produces one 1 daughter and one 0 daughter with probability  $2p(1 - p)$ . The probability that this 1 daughter ends up in either haploid 1 or 3 is  $1/2$ , for an overall probability of  $p(1 - p)$ .

The total probability is then  $p[1 - p + (1 + r_i)p/2] = p[1 - (1 - r_i)p/2]$ .

10 → 00: The probability of this pathway is  $1 - (1 - r_i)p^2/4 - p(1 - (1 - r_i)p/2) = 1 - p[1 - (1 - r_i)p/4]$ .

00 → 00: The probability for this pathway is simply 1.

### 3. $1 \leftrightarrow 4, 2 \leftrightarrow 3$

This case is symmetric to Case 2, so all of the probabilities are identical.

### 4. Infinite gene number equations

Given a diploid parent and a diploid daughter cell, where the daughter is characterized by  $l_{10}, l_{00}$ , let  $l_{i_1 i_2 j_1 j_2}$  denote the number of positions where the daughter is  $i_1, i_2$  and the parent is  $j_1, j_2$ . The probability that the parent diploid produces the daughter diploid as the left daughter cell is then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1 - p)]^{l_{1011}} (1 - p)^{2l_{0011}} \times \\
& \left(\frac{r_i}{2} p^2\right)^{l_{1110}} [p(1 - r_i p)]^{l_{1010}} [1 - p(1 - r_i p/2)]^{l_{0010}} \times \\
& \delta_{l_{1100} + l_{1000}, 0}, \\
& \text{for the } 1 \leftrightarrow 2, 3 \leftrightarrow 4 \text{ mating pattern.} \\
& p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1 - p)]^{l_{1011}} (1 - p)^{2l_{0011}} \times \\
& \left(\frac{1 - r_i}{4} p^2\right)^{l_{1110}} [p(1 - \frac{1 - r_i}{2} p)]^{l_{1010}} [1 - p(1 - \frac{1 - r_i}{4} p)]^{l_{0010}} \times \\
& \delta_{l_{1100} + l_{1000}, 0}, \\
& \text{for the } 1 \leftrightarrow 3, 2 \leftrightarrow 4 \text{ and} \\
& 1 \leftrightarrow 4, 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \text{ mating patterns.}
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Taking into account degeneracies and the probabilities for the various mating patterns, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{00}} + 2\frac{N!}{l_{10}!l_{00}!(N-l_{10}-l_{00})!} \times \\
&\sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1100}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{1000}=0}^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}} \frac{z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010},l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010}} \binom{N-l_{1110}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}}{l_{1100}+l_{1000}+l_{0000}}} \times \\
&\binom{N-l_{10}-l_{00}}{l_{1110}} \binom{N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}}{l_{1100}} \binom{l_{10}}{l_{1010}} \binom{l_{10}-l_{1010}}{l_{1000}} \binom{l_{00}}{l_{0010}} \binom{l_{00}-l_{0010}}{l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{1}{3} [p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1-p)]^{l_{1011}} (1-p)^{2l_{0011}} (\frac{r_i}{2} p^2)^{l_{1110}} [p(1-r_i p)]^{l_{1010}} [1-p(1-r_i p/2)]^{l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1100}+l_{1000},0} \\
&+ 2p^{2l_{1111}} [2p(1-p)]^{l_{1011}} (1-p)^{2l_{0011}} (\frac{1-r_i}{4} p^2)^{l_{1110}} [p(1-\frac{1-r_i}{2} p)]^{l_{1010}} [1-p(1-\frac{1-r_i}{4} p)]^{l_{0010}} \delta_{l_{1100}+l_{1000},0} \\
&= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{00}} + \frac{2}{3} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{N-l_{10}-l_{00}} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010},l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}!l_{1010}!l_{0010}!} \frac{1}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!} \frac{1}{(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!} \frac{(N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110}+l_{10}+l_{00}-l_{1010}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!}{(N-l_{10}-l_{00}-l_{1110})!} \times \\
&[p^{2(N-l_{10}-l_{00})+l_{1011}+l_{1010}} (2\epsilon)^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \epsilon^{2(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})} (\frac{r_i}{2})^{l_{1110}} [(1-r_i p)]^{l_{1010}} [1-p(1-r_i p/2)]^{l_{0010}} \\
&+ 2p^{2(N-l_{10}-l_{00})+l_{1011}+l_{1010}} (2\epsilon)^{l_{10}-l_{1010}} \epsilon^{2(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})} (\frac{1-r_i}{4})^{l_{1110}} [(1-\frac{1-r_i}{2} p)]^{l_{1010}} [1-p(1-\frac{1-r_i}{4} p)]^{l_{0010}}] \quad (49)
\end{aligned}$$

In the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we then obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dz_{l_{10},l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{00}} + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0010}=0}^{l_{00}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}-l_{0010}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010},l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{0010})!}{l_{1110}!l_{1010}!l_{0010}!} \frac{(2\mu)^{l_{10}-l_{1010}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!} \frac{\delta_{l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000},0}}{(l_{00}-l_{0010}-l_{0000})!} [(\frac{r_i}{2})^{l_{1110}+l_{0010}} (1-r_i)^{l_{1010}} + 2(\frac{1-r_i}{4})^{l_{1110}+l_{0010}} (\frac{1+r_i}{2})^{l_{1010}}] \\
&= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10},l_{00}} + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2\mu} \sum_{l_{1110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{1010}=0}^{l_{10}} \sum_{l_{0000}=0}^{l_{00}} \alpha^{l_{0000}} z_{l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{00}-l_{0000},l_{0000}} \times \\
&\frac{(l_{1110}+l_{1010}+l_{00}-l_{0000})!}{l_{1110}!l_{1010}!(l_{00}-l_{0000})!} \frac{(2\mu)^{l_{10}-l_{1010}}}{(l_{10}-l_{1010})!} [(\frac{r_i}{2})^{l_{1110}+l_{00}-l_{0000}} (1-r_i)^{l_{1010}} + 2(\frac{1-r_i}{4})^{l_{1110}+l_{00}-l_{0000}} (\frac{1+r_i}{2})^{l_{1010}}] \quad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

### C. Derivation details for the sexual reproduction pathway with random mating

#### 1. Two-chromosomed genome

For sexual reproduction with random mating, the dynamical equations are,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} n_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} + (\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma_1} n_{\sigma_2}, \text{ for } \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \\
\frac{dn_{\{\sigma,\sigma\}}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{\{\sigma,\sigma\}} n_{\{\sigma,\sigma\}} + \frac{1}{2} (\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma}^2 \quad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_{\sigma}}{dt} &= -(\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma} n_H + \sum_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} \kappa_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} n_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} \times \\
&\sum_{\sigma_{11}} \sum_{\sigma_{12}} \sum_{\sigma_{21}} \sum_{\sigma_{22}} p(\sigma_1, \sigma_{11}) p(\sigma_1, \sigma_{12}) p(\sigma_2, \sigma_{21}) p(\sigma_2, \sigma_{22}) \times \\
&[\delta_{\sigma_{11},\sigma} + \delta_{\sigma_{12},\sigma} + \delta_{\sigma_{21},\sigma} + \delta_{\sigma_{22},\sigma}] \\
&= -(\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma} n_H + 2 \sum_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} \kappa_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} n_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}} \times \\
&[p(\sigma_1, \sigma) + p(\sigma_2, \sigma)] \\
&= -(\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma} n_H + 4 \sum_{\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}, \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2} \kappa_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} n_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} \times \\
&[p(\sigma_1, \sigma) + p(\sigma_2, \sigma)] \\
&+ 4 \sum_{\{\sigma',\sigma'\}} \kappa_{(\sigma',\sigma')} n_{(\sigma',\sigma')} p(\sigma', \sigma) \\
&= -(\frac{\gamma}{V}) n_{\sigma} n_H + 4 \sum_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} n_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} p(\sigma_1, \sigma) \quad (52)
\end{aligned}$$

Defining the diploid ordered strand-pair population fractions via  $x_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} = n_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}/n$ , and the haploid population fractions via  $x_\sigma = n_\sigma/(2n)$ , we obtain, after converting from population numbers to population fractions, and using the fact that  $\rho = n/V$ , the dynamical equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}}{dt} &= -(\kappa_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} + \bar{\kappa}(t))x_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} + 2\gamma\rho x_{\sigma_1}x_{\sigma_2} \\ \frac{dx_\sigma}{dt} &= -\bar{\kappa}(t)x_\sigma - 2\gamma\rho x_\sigma x_H \\ +2 \sum_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \kappa_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} x_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} p(\sigma_1, \sigma) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

To develop the symmetrized equations in the limit of infinite sequence length, we proceed as follows: Given a haploid with genome  $\sigma$ , let  $l_1$  and  $l_0$  denote the number of positions where  $\sigma$  is 1 and 0, respectively. Given some  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ , let  $l_{ij_1 j_2}$  denote the number of positions where  $\sigma$  is  $i$ ,  $\sigma_1$  is  $j_1$ , and  $\sigma_2$  is  $j_2$ . We then have,

$$p(\sigma_1, \sigma) = p^{l_{111}+l_{110}}(1-p)^{l_{011}+l_{010}}\delta_{l_{101}+l_{100},0} \quad (54)$$

The evolutionary dynamics equations for the diploid population fractions  $z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}}$  are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}} \\ +2\gamma\rho \frac{N!}{l_{10}!l_{01}!l_{00}!(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00})!} \frac{z_{l_{10}+l_{00}}}{\binom{N}{l_{01}+l_{00}}} \frac{z_{l_{10}+l_{00}}}{\binom{N}{l_{10}+l_{00}}} \\ &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}} \\ +2\gamma\rho \frac{(l_{10}+l_{00})!(l_{01}+l_{00})!}{l_{10}!l_{01}!l_{00}!} \times \\ &\frac{(N-l_{01}-l_{00})!}{(N-l_{10}-l_{01}-l_{00})!} \frac{(N-l_{10}-l_{00})!}{N!} z_{l_{10}+l_{00}} z_{l_{01}+l_{00}} \\ &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00}} \\ +2\gamma\rho \frac{(l_{10}+l_{00})!(l_{01}+l_{00})!}{l_{10}!l_{01}!l_{00}!} \times \\ &\left(\prod_{k=1}^{l_{10}} \frac{N-l_{01}-l_{00}+k}{N-l_{10}-l_{00}+k}\right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{l_{00}} \frac{1}{N-l_{00}+k}\right) z_{l_{10}+l_{00}} z_{l_{01}+l_{00}} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

In the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we have,  $\prod_{k=1}^{l_{10}} (N-l_{01}-l_{00}+k)/(N-l_{10}-l_{00}+k) \rightarrow 1$ , and  $\prod_{k=1}^{l_{00}} 1/(N-l_{00}+k) \rightarrow \delta_{l_{00},0}$ , and so the infinite gene number equations for the diploid population is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_{10}, l_{01}, 0}}{dt} &= -(1 + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, 0} + 2\gamma\rho z_{l_{10}} z_{l_{01}} \\ \frac{dz_{l_{10}, l_{01}, l_{00} > 0}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{01}, 0} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Taking into account the transition probabilities and

various degeneracies, then for the haploids, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_0}}{dt} &= -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_{l_0} - 2\gamma\rho z_{l_0} z_H + 2 \binom{N}{l_0} \times \\ &\sum_{l_{110}=0}^{N-l_0} \sum_{l_{101}=0}^{N-l_0-l_{110}} \sum_{l_{100}=0}^{N-l_0-l_{110}-l_{101}} \\ &\sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{001}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}} \alpha^{l_{100}+l_{000}} \times \\ &\frac{z_{l_{110}+l_{010}, l_{101}+l_{001}, l_{100}+l_{000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{110}+l_{010}} \binom{N-l_{110}-l_{010}}{l_{101}+l_{001}} \binom{N-l_{110}-l_{010}-l_{101}-l_{001}}{l_{100}+l_{000}}} \times \\ &\binom{N-l_0}{l_{110}} \binom{N-l_0-l_{110}}{l_{101}} \binom{N-l_0-l_{110}-l_{101}}{l_{100}} \times \\ &\binom{l_0}{l_{010}} \binom{l_0-l_{010}}{l_{001}} \binom{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}}{l_{000}} \times \\ &p^{l_{111}+l_{110}}(1-p)^{l_{011}+l_{010}}\delta_{l_{101}+l_{100},0} \\ &= -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_{l_0} - 2\gamma\rho z_{l_0} z_H \\ +2 \sum_{l_{110}=0}^{N-l_0} \sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{001}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}} \alpha^{l_{000}} z_{l_{110}+l_{010}, l_{001}, l_{000}} \times \\ &\frac{(l_{110}+l_{010})!}{l_{110}!l_{010}!} \frac{1}{(l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}-l_{000})!} \times \\ &p^{N-l_0} \left[ \prod_{k=1}^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}-l_{000}} (N-l_0-l_{110}+k) \right] \epsilon^{l_{010}} \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

In the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_0}}{dt} &= -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_{l_0} - 2\gamma\rho z_{l_0} z_H \\ +2e^{-\mu} \sum_{l_{110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{001}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}} \alpha^{l_{000}} \times \\ &z_{l_{110}+l_{010}, l_{001}, l_{000}} \frac{(l_{110}+l_{010})!}{l_{110}!l_{010}!} \frac{\mu^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}-l_{000}}}{(l_0-l_{010}-l_{001}-l_{000})!} \delta_{l_{010},0} \\ &= -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_{l_0} - 2\gamma\rho z_{l_0} z_H \\ +2e^{-\mu} \sum_{l_{110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{001}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{001}} \alpha^{l_{000}} z_{l_{110}, l_{001}, l_{000}} \times \\ &\frac{\mu^{l_0-l_{001}-l_{000}}}{(l_0-l_{001}-l_{000})!} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

## 2. Multi-chromosome genome

To derive the quasispecies equations for sexual replication with random mating for the multi-chromosome case, we proceed as follows: We assume that a diploid produces four haploids that may be lined up and labelled “1”, “2”, “3”, “4”. We wish to determine what is the probability that haploid “1” receives a certain genome from a given parent diploid. As with the asexual case, since each of the homologous pairs segregate independently of one another, we may consider the probabilities of the various

segregation patterns for a given homologous pair. We consider each case in turn.

11 → 1: If a given homologous pair in a parent diploid is 11, then the corresponding gene in daughter haploid labelled “1” is the daughter of a 1 parent, so the probability that this daughter is itself a 1 is  $p$ . Therefore, the 11 → 1 probability is simply  $p$ .

11 → 0: Following a similar argument to the one given above, we obtain that the 11 → 0 probability is  $1 - p$ .

10 → 1: If a given homologous pair in a parent diploid is 10, then since a 0 parent gene produces two 0 daughters, the corresponding gene in the daughter haploid labelled “1” can only be 1 if it is the daughter of the 1 parent. By the symmetry of the chromosome segregation, the probability that the haploid gene is the daughter of the 1 parent is  $1/2$ . Since the probability that a daughter of the 1 parent is itself a 1 is  $p$ , we obtain an overall probability of  $p/2$ .

10 → 0: Since the probability of a 10 → 1 pathway is  $p/2$ , the probability of the 10 → 0 pathway is  $1 - p/2$ .

00 → 0: The probability of this pathway is 1.

Suppose a diploid is characterized by the parameters  $l_{10}, l_{00}$ . Suppose that two haploids, with sequences  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  fuse. If  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$ , then the diploid production rate is given by  $(\gamma/V)n_{\sigma_1}n_{\sigma_2}$ , while if  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ , then the diploid production rate is given by  $(1/2)(\gamma/V)n_{\sigma_1}n_{\sigma_2}$ .

If we let  $\hat{\sigma} = (\{s_{11}, s_{12}\}, \dots, \{s_{N1}, s_{N2}\})$  denote the genome of the diploid, where  $\{s_{i1}, s_{i2}\} = \{1, 1\}, \{1, 0\}, \{0, 0\}$ , and if we let  $\hat{\sigma}'$  denote the genome formed by the fusion of haploids with genomes  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ , then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dn_{\hat{\sigma}}}{dt} &= -\kappa_{\hat{\sigma}}n_{\hat{\sigma}} + \frac{\gamma}{V} \sum_{\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}, \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2, \hat{\sigma}' = \hat{\sigma}} n_{\sigma_1}n_{\sigma_2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{V} \sum_{\{\sigma, \sigma\}, \hat{\sigma}' = \hat{\sigma}} n_{\sigma}^2 \\ &= -\kappa_{\hat{\sigma}}n_{\hat{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{V} \sum_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2), \hat{\sigma}' = \hat{\sigma}} n_{\sigma_1}n_{\sigma_2} \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Now, where  $\hat{\sigma}$  is  $\{1, 1\}$ , we must have that both  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are 1. Where  $\hat{\sigma}$  is  $\{0, 0\}$ , we must have that both  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are 0. Where  $\hat{\sigma}$  is  $\{1, 0\}$ , we must have that  $\sigma_1$  is 1 and  $\sigma_2$  is 0, or  $\sigma_1$  is 0 and  $\sigma_2$  is 1. Let  $l$  denote the number of spots where  $\sigma_1$  is 1 and  $\sigma_2$  is 0. Since we want the fusion of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  to produce  $\hat{\sigma}$ , then the number of spots where  $\sigma_1$  is 0 and  $\sigma_2$  is 1 is  $l_{10} - l$ .

Taking into account degeneracies, we then have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dn_{l_{10}, l_{00}}}{dt} &= -\alpha^{l_{00}}n_{l_{10}, l_{00}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{V} \frac{N!}{l_{10}!l_{00}!(N - l_{10} - l_{00})!} \times \\ &\sum_{l=0}^{l_{10}} \binom{l_{10}}{l} \frac{n_{l_{10}-l+l_{00}}}{\binom{N}{l_{10}-l+l_{00}}} \frac{n_{l+l_{00}}}{\binom{N}{l+l_{00}}} \\ &= -\alpha^{l_{00}}n_{l_{10}, l_{00}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{V} \sum_{l=0}^{l_{10}} n_{l+l_{00}}n_{l_{10}-l+l_{00}} \times \\ &\frac{(l+l_{00})!(l_{10}-l+l_{00})!}{l!(l_{10}-l)!l_{00}!} \prod_{k=1}^l \frac{N-l_{10}-l_{00}+k}{N-l-l_{00}+k} \times \\ &\prod_{k=1}^{l_{00}} \frac{1}{N-l_{00}+k} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

In the limit of infinite sequence length, we have that  $l_{00}$  must equal 0 for the haploid fusion term to be non-zero, and so, after converting from population numbers to population fractions, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_{10}, 0}}{dt} &= -(1 + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, 0} + 2\gamma\rho \sum_{l=0}^{l_{10}} z_l z_{l_{10}-l} \\ \frac{dz_{l_{10}, l_{00} > 0}}{dt} &= -(\alpha^{l_{00}} + \bar{\kappa}(t))z_{l_{10}, l_{00}} \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

To derive the haploid equations, suppose a haploid is characterized by the parameter  $l_0$ . Given some parent diploid, let  $l_{ij_1j_2}$  denote the number of positions where the haploid is  $i$  and the diploid is  $j_1, j_2$ . We then have a total transition probability of,

$$p^{l_{111}}(1-p)^{l_{011}}\left(\frac{p}{2}\right)^{l_{110}}\left(1-\frac{p}{2}\right)^{l_{010}}\delta_{l_{100}, 0} \quad (62)$$

and so, taking into account degeneracies, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dn_{l_0}}{dt} &= -\frac{\gamma}{V}n_{l_0}n_H + 4\frac{N!}{l_0!(N-l_0)!} \times \\ &\sum_{l_{110}=0}^{N-l_0} \sum_{l_{100}=0}^{N-l_0-l_{110}} \sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \alpha^{l_{100}+l_{000}} \times \\ &\frac{n_{l_{110}+l_{010}, l_{100}+l_{000}}}{\binom{N}{l_{110}+l_{010}} \binom{N-l_{110}-l_{010}}{l_{100}+l_{000}}} \times \\ &\binom{N-l_0}{l_{110}} \binom{N-l_0-l_{110}}{l_{100}} \binom{l_0}{l_{010}} \binom{l_0-l_{010}}{l_{000}} \times \\ &p^{l_{111}}(1-p)^{l_{011}}\left(\frac{p}{2}\right)^{l_{110}}\left(1-\frac{p}{2}\right)^{l_{010}}\delta_{l_{100}, 0} \\ &= -\frac{\gamma}{V}n_{l_0}n_H + 4 \sum_{l_{110}=0}^{N-l_0} \sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \alpha^{l_{000}} \times \\ &\frac{(l_{110}+l_{010})!}{l_{110}!l_{010}!} \frac{1}{(l_0-l_{010}-l_{000})!} \times \\ &\frac{(N-l_0-l_{110}+l_0-l_{010}-l_{000})!}{(N-l_0-l_{110})!} \times \\ &p^{N-l_0} \epsilon^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{000}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_{110}} \left(1-\frac{p}{2}\right)^{l_{010}} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Converting to population fractions, and passing to the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz_{l_0}}{dt} = & -\bar{\kappa}(t)z_{l_0} - 2\gamma\rho z_{l_0}z_H + 2e^{-\mu} \times \\ & \sum_{l_{110}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l_{010}=0}^{l_0} \sum_{l_{000}=0}^{l_0-l_{010}} \alpha^{l_{000}} z_{l_{110}+l_{010}, l_{000}} \times \\ & \frac{(l_{110} + l_{010})!}{l_{110}!l_{010}!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{l_{110}+l_{010}} \frac{\mu^{l_0-l_{010}-l_{000}}}{(l_0 - l_{010} - l_{000})!} \quad (64) \end{aligned}$$

### Acknowledgments

This research was supported by a Start-Up Grant from the United States – Israel Binational Science Foundation, and by an Alon Fellowship from the Israel Science Foundation.

### References

- Agrawal AF (2006) Evolution of sex: Why do organisms shuffle their genotypes? *Curr. Biol.* 16: R696-R704
- Barton NH, Otto SP (2005) Evolution of recombination due to random drift. *Genetics* 169:2353-2370
- Bell G (1982) The masterpiece of nature: The evolution and genetics of sexuality. Croom Helm, London.
- Bernstein H, Byerly HC, Hopf FA, Michod RE (1984) Origin of sex. *J. Theor. Biol.* 110:323-351
- Bruggeman J, Debets AJM, Wijngaarden PJ, de Visser JAGM, Hoekstra RF (2003) Sex slows down the accumulation of deleterious mutations in the homothallic fungus *Aspergillus nidulans*. *Genetics* 164:479-485
- Bull JJ, Meyers LA, Lachmann M (2005) Quasispecies made simple. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 1:e61
- Crow JF, Kimura M (1965) Evolution in sexual and asexual populations. *Am. Nat.* 99:439-450
- De Massy B, Baudat F, Nicolas A (1994) Initiation of recombination in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* haploid meiosis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 91:11929-11933
- Hamilton WD, Axelrod R, Tanese R (1990) Sexual reproduction as an adaptation to resist parasites (a review). *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 87:3566-3573
- Herskowitz I (1988) Life cycle of the budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Microbiol. Rev.* 52:536-553
- Howard RS, Lively CM (1994) Parasitism, mutation accumulation, and the maintenance of sex. *Nature (London)* 367:554-557
- Hurst LD, Peck JR (1996) Recent advances in understanding of the evolution and maintenance of sex. *Trends Evol. Ecol.* 11:46-52
- Kamp C, Bornholdt S (2002) Co-evolution of quasispecies: B-cell mutation rates maximize viral error catastrophes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88:068104
- Keightley PD, Otto SP (2006) Interference among deleterious mutations favours sex and recombination in finite populations. *Nature (London)* 443:89-92
- Kondrashov AS (1988) Deleterious mutations and the evolution of sexual reproduction. *Nature (London)* 336:435-440
- Kondrashov AS, Crow JF (1991) Haploidy or diploidy: Which is better? *Nature (London)* 351:314-315
- Mable BK, Otto SP (1998) The evolution of life cycles with haploid and diploid phases. *BioEssays* 20:435-462
- Mandegar MA, Otto SP (2007) Mitotic recombination counteracts the benefits of genetic segregation. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 274:1301-1307
- Maynard-Smith J (1978) The evolution of sex. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK
- Michod RE (1995) Eros and evolution: A natural philosophy of sex. Addison-Wesley, New York
- Nedelcu AM, Marcu O, Michod RE (2004) Sex as a response to oxidative stress: A two-fold increase in cellular reactive oxygen species activates sex genes. *Proc. R. Soc. B. Biol. Sci.* 271:1591-1596
- Muller JH (1964) The relation of recombination to mutational advance. *Mutat. Res.* 1:2-9
- Paland S, Lynch M (2006) Transitions to asexuality result in excess amino-acid substitutions. *Science* 311:990-992
- Perrot V, Richerd S, Valero M (1991) Transition from haploidy to diploidy. *Nature (London)* 351:315-317
- Roeder GS (1995) Sex and the single cell: Meiosis in yeast. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 92:10450-10456
- Tannenbaum E, Fontanari JF (2008) A quasispecies approach to the evolution of sexual replication in unicellular organisms. *Theor. Biosci.* 127:53-65
- Tannenbaum E, Shakhnovich EI (2005) Semiconservative replication, genetic repair, and many-gened genomes: Extending the quasispecies paradigm to living systems. *Phys. Life Rev.* 2:290-317
- de Visser JAGM, Elena SF (2007) The evolution of sex: Empirical insights into the roles of epistasis and drift. *Nat. Genet.* 8:139-149
- Wilke CO (2005) Quasispecies theory in the context of population genetics. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 5:44
- Williams GC (1975) Sex and evolution. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Zeldovich KB, Chen P, Shakhnovich EI (2007) Protein stability imposes limits on organism complexity and speed of molecular evolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 104:16152-16157