

# Reproductive Value in Graph-structured Populations

Wes Maciejewski

Department of Mathematics  
The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

July 19, 2013

## Abstract

Evolutionary graph theory has grown to be an area of intense study. Despite the amount of interest in the field, it seems to have grown separate from other subfields of population genetics and evolution. In the current work I introduce the concept of Fisher's (1930) reproductive value into the study of evolution on graphs. Reproductive value is a measure of the expected genetic contribution of an individual to a distant future generation. In a heterogeneous graph-structured population, differences in the number of connections among individuals translates into differences in the expected number of offspring, even if all individuals have the same fecundity. These differences are accounted for by reproductive value. The introduction of reproductive value permits the calculation of the fixation probability of a mutant in a neutral evolutionary process in any graph-structured population for either the moran birth-death or death-birth process.

## 1 Introduction

Population structure has, for some time, been recognized as an important factor in determining the outcome of an evolutionary process. Structure can act to arrange individuals and produce evolutionary outcomes not seen in well-mixed populations [21]. Early models considered an infinite number of islands of individuals, each linked by global dispersal [32]. Subsequent work, like the stepping-stone model of [14, 31], considered the spatial arrangement of these islands. These models were refined to the finite population case by considering a finite number of breeding deems linked by dispersal patterns [16, 17]. Drawing on these ear-

25 lier models, evolutionary graph theory has emerged as a convenient framework for modelling  
26 population structure [18].

27 An evolutionary graph  $G$  is a collection of vertices  $V$  and edges  $E$  between them. The  
28 vertices are occupied by haploid individuals and the edges indicate who interacts with whom  
29 and where offspring disperse. Throughout this article I denote vertices by  $v_i$  and the indi-  
30 vidual residing on  $v_i$  by  $i$ . It is possible that the vertices are linked by two sets of edges,  
31 one indicating interactions and the other, replacements [24], but these two sets are often  
32 assumed to coincide, as they do in this article.

33 Since their introduction in [18], evolutionary graphs have become a well-studied represen-  
34 tation of structured populations. The exact features of graphs that promote, or work against,  
35 cooperation are, however, still elusive. For highly symmetric (vertex-transitive) graphs exact  
36 results for any additive game undergoing a weak-selection evolutionary process have been  
37 obtained [22, 29]. This is the largest class of graphs for which results are known, encompass-  
38 ing many other results [23, 12]. Actual interaction graphs are often highly non-symmetric  
39 [27] and it is of great interest to study evolution in these environments.

40 Very few results have been obtained for non-symmetric graphs. There has been some  
41 interest in the role of vertex degree. Some work [27] has focused on the distribution of the  
42 degrees of vertices. Certain distributions ('scale-free') have been shown to promote altruistic  
43 and cooperative behaviours more than others (eg. regular graphs). These approaches have  
44 uncovered global features of graphs and a description of the process at the level of the  
45 individual is desirable. One of the challenges faced in the study of heterogeneous populations  
46 is dealing with individuals of differing quality. *Reproductive value* [8] is a way of accounting  
47 for such differences.

48 Antal, Redner, and Sood [1] are perhaps the first to consider heterogeneous graphs at the  
49 individual scale. They have found that it is advantageous for the fitter mutant to occupy  
50 high-degree nodes in a Moran death-birth model (their 'biased voter model') and lower-

51 degree vertices in the birth-death process (their ‘biased invasion process’). This has been  
52 confirmed by subsequent research [4]. In the current article I show that these results, when  
53 phrased in terms of reproductive value [8, 11], are two sides of the same coin.

54 The work of [1] and [4] focuses on the case of *constant selection*, where the resident  
55 population has fecundity 1 and a mutant with fecundity  $r > 1$  arises. The probability of  
56 this mutant taking over the entire population is calculated and compared against the neutral  
57 case of  $r = 1$ . If this mutant fixation probability is greater, the mutant is advantageous.  
58 An extension of the results of [1] and [4] to the case of a public-goods game, as in [27],  
59 is highly desirable. I attempt to make headway by presenting an example that illustrates  
60 that a mutant individual can have greater evolutionary success depending on where it first  
61 emerges.

62 The main thrust of this article is a complete description of the fixation probability of  
63 an allele in any graph-structured population undergoing neutral drift. For a structured  
64 population of size  $N$  with the property that all sites are equivalent—for example, degree-  
65 regular graphs—then this fixation probability is  $1/N$ , irrespective on which vertex the allele  
66 is first found. This is not the case for degree-heterogeneous graphs. In general, the fixation  
67 probability depends on the degree of the vertex on which the allele initially appears. In the  
68 current article I calculate these fixation probabilities for both the birth-death and death-birth  
69 Moran processes on any graph. A general rule is derived: fixation probability is positively  
70 associated with relative reproductive value. An allele will have a higher fixation probability  
71 if it first emerges on a vertex with a higher reproductive value in both the birth-death and  
72 death-birth processes.

## 2 Reproductive Value

Reproductive value has been defined in various ways by different authors. The core of the definitions is the notion of long-term genetic share of a population. R.A. Fisher [8] first introduced reproductive value as a means of accounting for the differences in the reproductive output of different ages of females. Since that time reproductive value has been applied to age [7], sex [28], and spatially-structured [25] populations and has been placed on a rigorous mathematical footing [11]. At an intuitive level, the relative reproductive value of an individual  $i$  is the probability that  $i$  is the ancestor of a randomly chosen individual in a distant future generation [30].

To define reproductive value, I suppose that the individuals in the population under consideration are neutral with respect to selection. That is, the genotype of an individual does not affect their fitness. Births and deaths occur at random in the population. Throughout this article I work with two Moran processes, which will be made explicit, that ensure a fixed population size. In the birth-death process, a birth occurs randomly in the population and the new offspring displaces a neighbouring individual, who dies. In the death-birth process an individual is chosen to die and a neighbouring individual is chosen at random to place an offspring on the newly vacated site. These birth and death probabilities are captured by a transition matrix  $M$ . Specifically, I define the  $i, j$  entry of  $M$  to be the probability  $p_{ij}$  that the current individual  $i$  is the offspring of individual  $j$  produced during a birth/death event. This entry will differ depending on whether births precede deaths or vice versa, and examples throughout the article will illustrate this. An individual may be unaffected by the birth/death event in which case we say that such an individual is “from itself”.

As a first example of such an  $M$  matrix, consider a birth-death process on the 3-line graph in Figure 1. In the neutral process all individuals have the same fecundity and are therefore chosen to reproduce with equal probability, which in the 3-line case is  $1/3$ . If the



Figure 1: The line graph on three vertices is the simplest example of a degree-heterogenous graph. Label the vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ , and  $v_3$  from left to right. As is shown in the penultimate section, spiteful behaviours can evolve in such a population structure and these depend on where the spiteful individual first emerges.

98 centre, or hub, individual is chosen, then it places an offspring on either leaf vertex with  
 99 probability  $1/2$ . If a leaf is chosen, its offspring disperses to the hub with probability 1.  
 100 Given the current state of the population, we can ask where the individual on a leaf vertex  
 101 was before a birth-death event. With probability  $1/6$ , the individual is the offspring of the  
 102 hub vertex and with probability  $5/6$  the individual was unaffected by the birth-death event  
 103 and was already resident on the leaf vertex. For the hub individual, with probability  $1/3$  it  
 104 came from one of leaf vertices and with probability  $1/3$  it was unaffected by the birth-death  
 105 event and already resident on the hub. In all, with the vertex numbering in Figure 1,

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{5}{6} & \frac{1}{6} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{5}{6} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

106 This matrix  $M$  can be used to find the vector of probabilities of the origin of the left-most  
 107 leaf individual. Represent this individual with the vector  $[1, 0, 0]$ . This yields,

$$[1, 0, 0] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{5}{6} & \frac{1}{6} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{5}{6} \end{bmatrix} = \left[ \frac{5}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, 0 \right], \quad (2)$$

108 which captures the argument above: with probability  $5/6$  the leaf individual was unaffected  
 109 by the birth-death event and with probability  $1/6$  it is an offspring of the hub individual.

110 Another right-multiplication by  $M$  yields the probability vector for two generations previous.  
 111 And so on.

112 To find the probability that a randomly chosen individual in the population at a time  $t$ ,  
 113 measured in the number of birth/death events, in the future is from the lineage originating  
 114 from individual  $i$  at the present time  $t_0 = 0$ , we perform a calculation similar to the above  
 115 on the vector  $[1, 1, 1]$ :

$$[1, 1, 1] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{5}{6} & \frac{1}{6} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{5}{6} \end{bmatrix}^t. \quad (3)$$

116 This expression converges rapidly as  $t$  increases [2]. Hence, the vector resulting from the  
 117 calculation in Expression (3) above is stable to additional right-multiplications by  $M$  for  
 118 sufficiently large  $t$ . This vector is the vector of reproductive values and when normalized,  
 119 yields the probability distribution of the origin of a randomly-chosen individual. This is  
 120 captured in the following definition, which is a common contemporary version of Fisher's  
 121 original reproductive value [26, 2].

122 **Definition 1.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $M$  be the backward neutral transition probability matrix*  
 123 *defined above. The reproductive value of individual  $i$  is the  $i$ th entry  $V_i$  of the non-zero*  
 124 *solution vector  $V$  of the equation  $V = VM$ . That is,  $V$  is the left eigenvector of  $M$ .*

125 It is worth noting that the equation  $V = VM$  does not have a unique solution for  $V$ ;  
 126 any non-zero multiple  $c$  of a solution  $V_0$  is also a solution. Therefore, reproductive values  
 127 are understood throughout this article as relative values.

128 In the neutral process on a graph, some vertices may be favoured by the population  
 129 dynamics and the individual residing on such a vertex can expect to have a greater number  
 130 of offspring. These natural differences need to be accounted for in an evolutionary analy-

131 sis. In a non-neutral case, where the evolutionary outcome is determined by differences in  
132 fitness, some vertices may bestow a natural fitness advantage to the resident irrespective  
133 of the resident's trait value. Thinking in terms of evolutionary game theory, individuals  
134 residing on vertices interact along edges and experience gains and losses to fitness due to  
135 these interactions. These gains and losses may differ depending on who is receiving the  
136 benefit/cost [28]. An individual on a high-degree vertex may experience a loss of fitness,  
137 but this may be offset by the natural fitness advantage of residing on a high-degree vertex.  
138 These environment-mediated fitness differences must first be understood before proceeding  
139 with non-neutral evolutionary processes.

140 If the population structure is very symmetric—like the lattice structure in Figure 3—  
141 then all individuals have identical reproductive output. This is not the case for general,  
142 non-symmetric graphs, such as the line 3-line graph in Figure 1 or the wheel graph in  
143 Figure 2. In those examples, the differences in degrees results in differences in how often an  
144 individual replaces, or is replaced by an offspring of, another individual. These differences  
145 in fitness are accounted by reproductive value.




Figure 2: The wheel graph on 9 vertices.

146 As an illustrative example, consider the wheel graph in Figure 2. There are two types of  
147 vertices, those on the periphery, denoted  $v_P$ , and the lone centre, denoted  $v_H$ . Consider, in  
148 turn, both a birth-death and a death-birth Moran process [19] on this graph, and suppose

149 that the population is neutral. In the birth-death process an individual is chosen at random  
150 to give birth and the resulting offspring displaces an adjacent neighbour at random. The  
151 individual at vertex  $v_H$  is chosen to give birth with probability  $1/9$ , yet its neighbours are  
152 selected with probability  $8/9$ . Once a  $v_P$  resident is selected, it displaces  $v_H$  with probability  
153  $1/3$ . In the death-birth process  $v_H$  is chosen to die with probability  $1/9$  but its neighbours are  
154 chosen with probability  $8/9$ . It would seem, then, that individuals at vertex  $v_H$  is somehow  
155 “better off” in the death-birth than in the birth-death scheme. This is indeed the case. The  
156 way of quantifying “better-off-ness” is with reproductive value.

### 157 **3 Metapopulations**

158 A metapopulation is a collection of *demes* all linked by a dispersal pattern. Evolutionary  
159 graphs can often be thought of metapopulations where the vertices are demes and the edges  
160 are the dispersal pattern. Metapopulations were introduced by Levins [17] as a means  
161 of describing populations with subpopulations experiencing extinction and re-colonization.  
162 Since [17], the scope and generality of metapopulation models has increased dramatically;  
163 see [13] for an introduction.

164 Consider a metapopulation consisting of  $N$  demes  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N$ . Each deme  $v_i$  is a  
165 well-mixed population of fixed size  $N_i$ . The total population size is a constant,  $N_{tot}$ . After  
166 reproduction the offspring migrate to another deme with probability  $m$  or stay on their natal  
167 deme with probability  $1 - m$  and for simplicity I assume the value of  $m$  is identical for all  
168 demes.

169 There are many possible population dynamics, for example, the Wright-Fisher process  
170 [32], imitation dynamics [1], and the Cannings process [6]. I restrict the focus of this article  
171 to two: the Moran death-birth and birth-death processes [19]. In the death-birth process  
172 an individual is chosen at random to die. Suppose this individual resides on deme  $v_i$ . With



173 probability  $1 - m$  the newly vacated site is occupied by the offspring of a deme mate. With  
 174 probability  $m$  it is occupied by the offspring of a member of a neighbouring deme  $v_j$  chosen  
 175 according to its relative size,

$$\frac{N_j}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} N_k}, \quad (4)$$

176 where the sum is taken over all deme  $v_i$ 's neighbouring demes  $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ .

177 In the above definition I have assumed uniform dispersal probabilities to a deme. That  
 178 is, if an individual on  $v_i$  dies and is not replaced by a deme mate, then it is replaced by the  
 179 offspring of a neighbouring deme  $v_j$  with probability proportional to  $v_j$ 's size relative to the  
 180 other neighbours of  $v_i$ . It is possible, however, that offspring are more likely to come from  
 181 certain demes, regardless of the resident population size.

182 Denote the probability that an individual chosen to die on  $v_i$  is replaced by the offspring  
 183 of an individual from  $v_j$ , conditional on the individual not being replaced by the offspring of  
 184 another individual on deme  $v_i$ , by  $w_{ji}$ . If an individual dies on deme  $v_i$  and the empty site  
 185 is not taken by the offspring of a deme  $v_i$  individual, then it is taken by the offspring from  
 186 a neighbouring deme. Hence,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ji} = 1. \quad (5)$$

187 With this notion of non-uniform dispersal probability, the probability that a newly vacated  
 188 site on deme  $i$  is occupied by an offspring of deme  $j$  is given by

$$\frac{w_{ji} N_j}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} w_{ki} N_k}. \quad (6)$$

189 In the birth-death process an individual is chosen at random to reproduce and the new

190 offspring either stays on its natal deme with probability  $1 - m$  and displaces a deme-mate  
 191 or disperses to a neighbouring deme with probability  $m$ . The neighbouring deme is chosen  
 192 according to the dispersal probabilities  $u_{ij}$ . Define  $u_{ij}$  to be the probability that an offspring  
 193 produced on  $v_i$  disperses to and replaces an individual on deme  $v_j$ , conditional on the offspring  
 194 not staying and replacing an individual on  $v_i$ . Note that, similar to the above,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} u_{ij} = 1. \quad (7)$$

195 It is to be kept in mind that the  $u_{ij}$  are the dispersal probabilities in the birth-death  
 196 process while the  $w_{ji}$  are in the death-birth process. In general, the  $u_{ij}$  and  $w_{ji}$  are not  
 197 equal; a distinction I will draw in the next section. The difference between the two may seem  
 198 subtle— $u_{ij}$  is the probability that an offspring produced on deme  $i$  displaces an individual  
 199 on deme  $j$ , while  $w_{ji}$  is the probability that an empty site on deme  $j$  is filled by an offspring  
 200 from deme  $i$ —but must be kept in mind. The real difference between the  $u_{ij}$  and  $w_{ji}$  is the  
 201  $u_{ij}$  are normalized with respect to the deme dispersed from, while  $w_{ji}$  is normalized with  
 202 respect to the deme dispersed to. This distinction allows Equations (8) and (9) to be easily  
 203 generalized to graph-structured populations. Note that for uniform dispersal probabilities on  
 204 degree-regular graphs,  $u_{ij} = w_{ji}$ .

205 I now derive equations for the reproductive values in the Moran death-birth and birth-  
 206 death processes in metapopulations. To do this, I define a matrix  $M$  similar to that in  
 207 Definition 1, but where the entries are indexed by demes, not individuals. Specifically,  
 208 the  $i, j$  entry of  $M$  is the probability that a randomly chosen individual on deme  $v_j$  was from  
 209 the deme  $v_i$  before a birth/death event. Definition 1 then yields a reproductive value  $V_i$  for  
 210 each deme  $v_i$ . To find the reproductive value of an individual on deme  $v_i$ , simply divide the  
 211 deme reproductive value by the size of the deme,  $V_i/N_i$ . In all, this yields the following.

212 **Theorem 1.** *Consider a metapopulation of size  $N_{tot}$  residing on  $N$  demes structured ac-*

213 cording to some graph  $G$ . Deme  $v_i$  is of size  $N_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Denote the reproductive  
 214 value of deme  $v_i$  by  $V_i$ .

215 1. For the death-birth process, the  $V_i$  satisfy

$$V_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} \frac{w_{ij} N_i}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(v_j)} w_{kj} N_k} V_j. \quad (8)$$

216 2. For the birth-death process, the  $V_i$  satisfy

$$\left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ji} N_j \right) V_i = N_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ij} V_j. \quad (9)$$

217 In both cases the sums are taken over all neighbours  $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$  of  $v_i$ , or neighbours  $\mathcal{N}(v_j)$  of  $v_j$ .

218 *Proof.* This is done by simply calculating the columns of the matrix  $M$ . I demonstrate this  
 219 for the death-birth process only, since Equation (9) is found in a similar way. Entry  $j$  in  
 220 the  $i$ th column of  $M$  is the probability  $p_{ji}$  that an individual currently in deme  $v_j$  was in  
 221 deme  $v_i$  before the death-birth event. For the entry  $p_{ii}$ , an individual on deme  $v_i$  either was  
 222 unaffected by the death-birth event, with probability  $(N_{tot} - 1)/N_{tot}$ , or is the offspring of a  
 223  $v_i$  deme mate, with probability  $(1 - m)/N_{tot}$ . For all  $p_{ji}$  with  $j \neq i$ , an individual on deme  
 224  $v_j$  is the offspring of a deme  $v_i$  individual with probability

$$\frac{m}{N_{tot}} \frac{w_{ij} N_i}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(v_j)} w_{kj} N_k}. \quad (10)$$

225 Substituting these expressions into the backward transition probability matrix  $M$  and eval-

226 uating the equation for reproductive value in Definition 1 for  $V_i$  yields,

$$V_i = \frac{N_{tot} - 1}{N_{tot}} V_i + \frac{1 - m}{N_{tot}} V_i + \frac{m}{N_{tot}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} \frac{w_{ij} N_i}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(v_j)} w_{kj} N_k} V_j. \quad (11)$$

227 Simplifying gives Equation (8) in Theorem 1. □

228 Theorem 1 demonstrates how the reproductive values in a metapopulation depend only  
 229 on the size of the demes and the rates of dispersal. An interesting example to consider is a  
 230 heterogeneous metapopulation that has all demes of the same reproductive value. Suppose  
 231 such a metapopulation is structured according to the wheel graph of the previous section.  
 232 Deme  $v_H$  is of size  $N_H$  and  $v_P$  is of size  $N_P$ . Setting  $V_P = V_H$  in the equation in Theorem  
 233 1 that describes the death-birth process yields a system of equations for  $N_P$  and  $N_H$  with  
 234 solution  $N_H = 6N_P$ . That is, in a metapopulation structured according to the 9-wheel graph,  
 235 the reproductive values of all the demes are equal provided  $N_H = 6N_P$ . The individual  
 236 reproductive values are obtained by dividing the deme RVs by the size of the deme. In  
 237 this way it is seen that an individual in a periphery deme in a population undergoing a  
 238 death-birth process has a greater reproductive value than on in the hub, despite both being  
 239 members of deme with the same average reproductive value.

## 240 4 Graph-structured Populations

A graph-structured population is a special case of a metapopulation with  $N_i = 1$  for all  $i$   
 and  $N_{tot} = N$ . There are a couple of ways we can analyse the reproductive value equations  
 in Theorem 1 in the context of evolutionary graphs. First I consider the case that the  
 probability of offspring dispersal from a vertex to a neighbouring vertex is uniform. That is,

I set

$$w_{ji} = u_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1/d_i & \text{if } v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ are adjacent} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

241 where  $d_i$  is the degree of vertex  $i$  and  $w_{ji}$  and  $u_{ij}$  are the death-birth and birth-death dispersal  
242 probabilities, respectively, defined in the previous section. This yields the following solutions  
243 to the equations in Theorem 1.

244 **Corollary 1.** *For an evolutionary graph with uniform dispersal from any vertex the repro-*  
245 *ductive values  $V_i$  for the vertices  $v_i$  of degrees  $d_i$  are as follows.*

246 1. *For the death-birth process,*

$$V_i = d_i \tag{12}$$

247 2. *For the birth-death process,*

$$V_i = \frac{1}{d_i}. \tag{13}$$

248 This corollary is very useful in describing the neutral process, which will be done next.  
249 First note that the equations in Theorem 1 have a degree of freedom, so there are an infinite  
250 number of solutions. But they are all scalar multiples of those given above.

251 I now consider the relationship between reproductive value and fixation probability. Sup-  
252 pose a population consists entirely of one type (type  $B$ ) of individual. After a reproductive  
253 event a mutant (type  $A$ ) appears. The probability that the progeny of the mutant go on to  
254 displace all resident types is the fixation probability  $\rho_A$  of  $A$ . In general this fixation prob-  
255 ability depends on where in the population the  $A$  type emerges. Define  $\rho_{A|i}$  as the fixation  
256 probability of an  $A$  that emerges on vertex  $v_i$ .

257 It is known (ex. [15]) that the fixation probability of a neutral mutant in a metapopulation

258 is equal to its relative reproductive value. This fact can easily be seen to be the case from a  
 259 result of [3].

260 **Theorem 2.** *Let  $G$  be an evolutionary graph with  $N$  vertices and suppose the edges are*  
 261 *uniformly weighted. The fixation probability  $\rho_{A|i}$  of a single  $A$  type that emerges on vertex  $v_i$*   
 262 *of  $G$  in the neutral population is*

$$\rho_{A|i} = \frac{V_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N V_j}, \quad (14)$$

263 where  $V_i$  is the reproductive value of vertex  $v_i$ .

264 A proof of this result is in the appendix.

265 The fundamental question in evolutionary theory is, when does a mutant have an evolu-  
 266 tionary advantage over a resident population? A natural condition is that the probability  $\rho$   
 267 that the mutant fixes in the population is greater than what it would be in the absence of  
 268 selection. From early on in the evolutionary graph theory literature [18] this condition took  
 269 the form  $\rho_A > 1/N$ , where  $A$  is the mutant and  $N$  is the total population size. Theorem 2  
 270 indicates that this condition is insufficient for graphs with vertices of differing degrees. For  
 271 an arbitrary graph,  $\rho_{A|i}$  depends on  $i$ . Notice, however,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_{A|i} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{V_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N V_j} = \frac{1}{N}. \quad (15)$$

272 Returning to the wheel graph example, Theorem 2 allows for an easy calculation of the  
 273 neutral fixation probability of a hub  $\rho_{A|H}$  or periphery  $\rho_{A|P}$  mutant on a wheel graph of  
 274 arbitrary size,  $N + 1$ . Table 1 records these fixation probabilities for both the birth-death  
 275 and death-birth processes.

276 A few interesting observations can be made at this point. First, in the death-birth  
 277 process  $\rho_{A|H}$  does not depend on the size of the population. This is understood as a balance

	DB	BD
$\rho_{A H}$	1/4	$3/(N^2 + 3)$
$\rho_{A P}$	$3/(4N)$	$N/(N^2 + 3)$

Table 1: The fixation probabilities for an allele that begins on a hub or on a periphery vertex for both the birth-death and death-birth Moran processes.

278 between the probabilities that the hub or a periphery individual is chosen to die. For large  
 279 populations the probability that the hub dies is essentially zero, yet the probability that  
 280 the hub reproduces is fixed at 1/3. Second, for the birth-death process, both  $\rho_{A|P}$  and  $\rho_{A|H}$   
 281 go to 0 as  $N$  increases. This is because for large populations the probability that any one  
 282 individual is chosen to reproduce is close to 0.

283 An interesting extension of Theorem 2 is to the neutral fixation probability of a set  $M$   
 284 of  $A$  types. Such a fixation probability is defined as the probability that the population  
 285 eventually consists entirely of all  $A$  given that it initially started with a set  $M \subset V(G)$  of  
 286  $A$ s.

287 **Theorem 3.** *The neutral fixation probability  $\rho_{A|M}$  of a set  $M$  of  $A$  types on a graph  $G$*   
 288 *undergoing either a birth-death or death-birth Moran process is*

$$\rho_{A|M} = \sum_{i \in M} \rho_{A|i}. \quad (16)$$

289 *That is, the neutral fixation probability of a set of  $A$  types is the sum of the individual neutral*  
 290 *fixation probabilities.*

291 A proof of this theorem is found in the appendix.

292 This theorem is remarkable in that the configuration of the  $A$  types is irrelevant. It does  
 293 not matter if the set  $M$  is clustered or spread about the graph; the fixation probability is  
 294 the same; see Figure 3.




Figure 3: The fixation probability of a set of individuals is the sum of the fixation probabilities of the individuals in the set. In this example on a lattice, the set of black individuals has the same fixation probability whether they are clumped (a) or spread out (b).

## 295 5 Non-neutral Cases

296 So far I have analysed the equation in Theorem 1 by supposing that the dispersal from  
 297 any vertex  $i$  to a neighbouring  $j$  is  $w_{ji} = u_{ij} = 1/d_i$ . This need not be the case. One could  
 298 imagine a population residing in a windy or a stream environment that results in preferential  
 299 dispersal. Removing the assumption of uniform dispersal makes Theorem 1 less transparent.  
 300 Relating reproductive value to an existing object in the study of evolutionary graphs, the  
 301 *temperature* of vertices as introduced in [18], allows us to gain some traction.

302 For the birth-death process, the temperature  $T_i$  of a vertex  $v_i$  is

$$T_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ji}, \tag{17}$$

303 where the sum is over all neighbours of  $v_i$ . If the graph is weighted with  $w_{ji}$  weights, as in  
 304 the death-birth process, the above definition can be rewritten accordingly:

$$T_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} w_{ij}. \tag{18}$$



305 Equation (18) is not the definition of temperature as found in, e.g. [18, 20]. Previous work  
 306 on the temperature of vertices has only considered the birth-death process. As we have  
 307 seen in Equation (8) it is necessary to introduce  $w_{ji}$  for the death-birth process. Recall that  
 308  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} w_{ji} = 1$ . The  $T_i$  in Equation (18) does not necessarily equal 1, and therefore plays  
 309 the same role for the  $w_{ij}$  that the temperature  $T_i$  in Equation (17) does for the  $u_{ji}$ . It can  
 310 be shown that the existing results on temperature, including Theorem 4 below, also hold for  
 311 graphs carrying the  $w_{ji}$  weightings.

312 The fundamental result concerning the temperatures on an evolutionary graph is the  
 313 isothermal theorem of [18] (see also [20]). Suppose a mutant with fecundity  $r$ , where  $r > 1$ ,  
 314 emerges in a population of individuals each having fecundity 1. The population updates with  
 315 a Moran process and the probability  $\rho$  that the mutant fixes in the population is observed.  
 316 This is the constant-fecundity process [18].

317 The results of [18] are that for an *isothermal* graph, where all vertices have the same  
 318 temperature, the fixation probability is exactly what one would find in a unstructured  
 319 population—that is, where all vertices are adjacent; a *complete* graph—of the same size,  $N$ .

320 **Theorem 4.** (*Lieberman et al., 2005*) *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $T_i$  be the temperature of the*  
 321 *vertex  $v_i$ . For the constant-fecundity process described above,*

$$\rho_A = \frac{1 - 1/r}{1 - 1/r^N} \tag{19}$$

322 *if, and only if,*

$$T_i = T_j \quad \forall i, j \in V(G). \tag{20}$$

323

324 Equation (20) is the isothermal condition. This relates nicely to reproductive value.

325 **Theorem 5.** *A graph is isothermal if, and only if, all vertices have the same reproductive*  
 326 *value.*

327 *Proof.* First, assume  $V_i = V_j$  for all vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  of  $G$ . From Equation 8, I have

$$V_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} w_{ij} V_j \implies \underbrace{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} w_{ij}}_{T_i} = 1 \quad (21)$$

328 for the death-birth process, and

$$\left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ji} \right) V_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ij} V_j \implies \underbrace{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ji}}_{T_i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} u_{ij} = 1 \quad (22)$$

329 for the birth-death process.

330 Now assume  $T_i = T_j$  for all vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  of  $G$ . Suppose, for contradiction, that not  
 331 all vertices of  $G$  have the same reproductive value. There exists a vertex  $v_k$  such that  $V_k$  is  
 332 the maximum of all reproductive values and at least one neighbour of  $v_k$  has a reproductive  
 333 value strictly less than  $V_k$ . Similarly, let vertex  $v_l$  be such that  $V_l$  is the minimum of all  
 334 reproductive values and at least one neighbour of  $v_l$  has a reproductive value greater than  
 335  $V_l$ . Consider the death-birth process; the argument for the birth-death process is similar.  
 336 From Equation 8,

$$V_k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_k)} w_{kj} V_j < \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_k)} w_{kj} V_k \implies T_k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_k)} w_{kj} > 1. \quad (23)$$

337 Also,

$$V_l = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_l)} w_{lj} V_j > \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_l)} w_{lj} V_l \implies T_l = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_l)} w_{lj} < 1. \quad (24)$$

338 Hence,  $T_k \neq T_l$ , which is a contradiction. □

In [5] the authors prove that, assuming dispersal from a vertex is uniform, a graph is isothermal if, and only if, the graph is regular. In light of Corollary 1 or Theorem 4, an analogous result exists for reproductive value. An interesting question is, is it possible for the vertices of a non-regular graph to all have the same reproductive value? The answer is yes, as is seen by, once again, returning to the wheel graph example. For the wheel graph on 9 vertices in Figure 1 consider the birth-death process and define the dispersal probabilities

$$u_{PH} = \frac{1}{8}, \quad u_{PP} = \frac{7}{16}, \quad \text{and, } u_{HP} = \frac{1}{8}.$$

339 This example is easily seen to be isothermal and hence, by Theorem 4, all vertices have the  
340 same reproductive value.

341 For the death-birth process and constant fecundity, higher-degree vertices are favoured  
342 for the emergence of more fecund alleles, since they confer a natural advantage: higher degree  
343 means a greater likelihood of a neighbour dying which translates into a greater-than-average  
344 chance of placing an offspring. The situation is reversed for the birth-death process: lower  
345 degree means less-than-average chance of being displaced by a neighbour's offspring. In both  
346 cases the favourable vertex is one with a high reproductive value.

347 Previous work on degree-heterogeneous graphs [4, 1] has reached the conclusion that  
348 the death-birth process favours mutants that emerge on vertices of high degree, while the  
349 birth-death process favours mutants arising on low degree vertices. This is precisely what  
350 is found in the corollary to Theorem 1. However, rather than viewing the results of [4, 1]  
351 as two separate cases, the above results on reproductive value allow us to observe a general  
352 phenomenon: the vertices that favour the mutant allele in the constant-selection framework  
353 are those with the greatest reproductive value, regardless if the update rule is death-birth  
354 or birth-death. The difference in fecundity acts to embellish the effect of reproductive value.

355 Reproductive value provides a unifying concept for these results.

## 356 5.1 Evolutionary Games

357 I now consider evolutionary games on graphs. Consider a population consisting of two  
358 types of individuals: *A*s and *B*s. Each pair connected by an edge gives and receives payoffs  
359 according to the game matrix

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	
<i>A</i>	$b - c$	$-c$	(25)
<i>B</i>	$b$	$0$	

360 For  $b, c > 0$ , this is the additive prisoner's dilemma game.

361 The payoffs accrued by individuals interacting according to the game in Matrix (25)  
362 translate into fecundity. The fecundity of an individual  $i$  is

$$f_i = e^{\delta P}, \quad (26)$$

363 where  $\delta$  is the strength of selection and  $P$  is the payoff received from playing the game with  
364 their neighbours [18]. For example, if an *A* individual has one *A* and two *B* neighbours then  
365 their total payoff is  $P = b - c + 2(-c) = b - 3c$ . Once these fecundity values are calculated, a  
366 population update occurs. For the death-birth process, an individual  $i$  dies with probability  
367  $1/N$  and is replaced by an offspring of its neighbour  $j$  with probability

$$\frac{f_j}{f_{tot}}, \quad (27)$$

368 where  $f_{tot}$  is the total fecundity of all the neighbours of  $i$ . For the birth-death process, an

369 individual  $i$  is chosen for reproduction with probability

$$\frac{f_i}{f_{tot}}, \quad (28)$$

370 and the offspring displaces a neighbour of  $i$  with uniform probability,  $1/d_i$ .

371 To illustrate the effects of reproductive value on the outcome of an evolutionary game,  
372 I consider the simplest example of a heterogeneous graph, the 3-line in Figure 1. Denote a  
373 end point vertex with the subscript  $p$  and the central hub vertex with  $h$ . I consider only the  
374 birth-death process.

375 The reproductive values for the birth-death process are easily calculated from Corollary  
376 1:

$$V_p = 1, \quad \text{and,} \quad V_h = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (29)$$

377 Hence, in the neutral process, where  $\delta = 0$  in Equation (26),

$$\rho_p = \frac{2}{5}, \quad \text{and,} \quad \rho_h = \frac{1}{5}. \quad (30)$$

378 The neutral fixation probabilities  $\rho_{neutral}$  give us a condition for the spread of the strategy  $A$ :  
379  $A$  is favoured by evolution provided  $\rho_A > \rho_{neutral}$ . Note that, for regular graphs, a class of  
380 graph that includes complete, cycles, lattices, and all vertex-transitive graphs, this condition  
381 reduces to  $\rho_A > 1/N$ , which is the condition commonly found in the literature [20]. In the  
382 present example, an  $A$  type is favoured by evolution provided  $\rho_{A|p} > \rho_{neutral|p} = 2/5$  if it  
383 emerges on an end vertex and  $\rho_{A|h} > \rho_{neutral|h} = 1/5$  on the hub vertex.

384 I now calculate the probability that a single  $A$  reaches fixation in a population otherwise  
385 comprised of all  $B$ . To do this, I assume weak selection. This means that  $\delta \ll 1$  in Equation  
386 (26). This allows for an accurate Taylor series approximation for Equation (26).

387 Now suppose that the 3-line population initially consists of all  $B$ . A mutant  $A$  appears  
 388 on one of the end point vertices. It is easy to show, by solving a system of equations that  
 389 describes the fixation probability, that the fixation probability of this mutant is

$$\rho_{A|p} = \frac{2}{5} - \left( \frac{14}{25}c + \frac{6}{25}b \right) \delta + o(\delta). \quad (31)$$

390 The condition  $\rho_{A|p} > \rho_{neutral|p}$  yields a condition on the  $b$  and  $c$  parameters. Namely, an  $A$   
 391 type on an end point vertex is favoured by evolution provided  $b/c < -7/3$ . This condition  
 392 is clearly never satisfied for positive  $b$  and  $c$ . If, however,  $b < 0$ , then the condition can be  
 393 satisfied. This is an example of a *spiteful* behaviour: an individual pays a cost to purposely  
 394 harm another [10].

395 A similar calculation reveals that the fixation probability of an  $A$  type that emerges on  
 396 the hub vertex is

$$\rho_{A|h} = \frac{1}{5} - \left( \frac{12}{25}c + \frac{14}{75}b \right) \delta + o(\delta). \quad (32)$$

397 This  $A$  is favoured by evolution provided  $b/c < -18/7$ . Again, this is satisfied only when  
 398  $b < 0$ .

399 To compare these two results for the fixation probability of spite, suppose that the cost  
 400 of the spiteful act is fixed at  $c = 1$ . Then it is seen that the hub requires a higher level of  
 401 spite than the end point vertices in order for the trait to fix in the population. Put another  
 402 way, spite can emerge more easily on the end point vertices.

403 The lesson from this example is that the spread of strategy may be tied to where the  
 404 strategy first emerges. In turn, the favoured vertices are those with a greater reproductive  
 405 value.

## 6 Discussion

In this article, I have brought the notion of reproductive value into the study of evolution in graph-structured populations. This makes headway into unifying existing results on degree-heterogeneous graphs. Generally, for a constant-fecundity process in a graph-structured population, it may be best for the more fecund type to emerge on a vertex with high reproductive value. This depends on the type of population regulation. For birth-death updating, mutants are favoured on low-degree vertices, while mutants in the death-birth process are favoured high-degree vertices. This has been observed by other authors [1], but as separate cases. Reproductive value unites these into two sides of the same coin.

The main driving force of these differences is the neutral fixation probability. Some breeding sites are more advantageous to occupy in that they naturally confer a fitness advantage on their resident. This natural advantage is captured by the reproductive value of an individual on such a site.

The effect of heterogeneous population structures is still not well understood. It is now well-known that degree-heterogeneous graphs can affect evolution [1, 27, 5, 4], but an explanation of how the degrees of individual vertices contribute to these effects is still needed. The concept of reproductive value fills this void. In the neutral process, those individuals that reside on vertices of a higher reproductive value have a higher-than-average probability of fixing in the population. Understanding the neutral process allows for a baseline condition against which the fitness advantage of a non-neutral allele can be measured. Where the allele emerges matters. If the allele has a fixation probability greater than the relative reproductive value of the vertex on which it emerges, it is favoured by evolution. Such a condition opens up the further study of evolution in heterogeneous graph-structured populations.

This work also clarifies terminology existing in the literature. Take, for example, a statement from [27], “For regular graphs (in which, from the perspective of a population

431 structure, every individual is equivalent to any other)...” The meaning of such a statement  
432 is not entirely clear. The statement is true for *vertex-transitive* graphs, as shown in [29],  
433 where it is understood that the graph “looks the same” from every vertex. Reproductive  
434 value formalizes the idea present in the above statement: on a regular graph, all individuals  
435 have the same reproductive value. It should be noted that all vertex-transitive graphs are  
436 regular, but not all regular graphs are vertex-transitive; an example is the Frucht graph  
437 [9]. There are a host of factors that influence the outcome of an evolutionary process on a  
438 graph: the graph structure, including symmetry, the degree distribution, and the underlying  
439 structure; the population regulation scheme; and whether the population is experiencing  
440 constant or frequency-dependent selection. All of these factors need to be stated carefully  
441 to avoid the misinterpretation of results.

## 442 **7 Acknowledgements**

443 I am indebted to Christoph Hauert, Peter Taylor, Lucas Wardil, and to an anonymous  
444 reviewer for supplying valuable comments on drafts of this article. This work is supported  
445 by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## 446 **References**

- 447 [1] T. Antal, S. Redner, and V. Sood. Evolutionary dynamics on degree-heterogeneous  
448 graphs. *Physical Review Letters*, 96:188104–1–4, 2006.
- 449 [2] N. Barton and A. Etheridge. The relation between reproductive value and genetic  
450 contribution. *Genetics*, 188:953–973, 2011.



- 451 [3] M. Broom, C. Hadjichrysanthou, J. Rychtar, and B. Stadler. Two results on evolu-  
452 tionary processes on general non-directed graphs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*,  
453 466:2795–2798, 2010.
- 454 [4] M. Broom, J. Rychtar, and B. Stadler. Evolutionary dynamics on graphs—the effect of  
455 graph structure and initial placement on mutant spread. *Journal of Statistical Theory*  
456 *and Practice*, 5:369–381, 2011.
- 457 [5] M. Broom and J. Rychtář. An analysis of the fixation probability of a mutant on special  
458 classes of non-directed graphs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 464:2609–2627, 2008.
- 459 [6] C. Cannings. The latent roots of certain markov chains arising in genetics: A new  
460 approach, i. haploid models. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 6:260–290, 1974.
- 461 [7] B. Charlesworth. *Evolution in Age-structured Populations*. Cambridge University Press,  
462 1980.
- 463 [8] R.A. Fisher. *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*. Oxford University Press, 1930.
- 464 [9] R. Frucht. Graphs of degree three with a given abstract group. *Canadian Journal of*  
465 *Mathematics*, 1:365–378, 1949.
- 466 [10] A. Gardner and S. West. Spite. *Current Biology*, 16.
- 467 [11] A. Grafen. A theory of Fisher’s reproductive value. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*,  
468 53:15–60, 2006.
- 469 [12] A. Grafen. An inclusive fitness analysis of altruism on a cyclical network. *Journal of*  
470 *Evolutionary Biology*, 20:2278–2283, 2007.
- 471 [13] I. Hanski. Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature*, 396:41–49, 1998.

- 472 [14] M. Kimura and G.H. Weiss. The stepping stone model of population structure and the  
473 decrease of genetic correlation with distance. *Genetics*, 49:561–575, 1964.
- 474 [15] H. Leturque and F. Rousset. Dispersal, kin competition, and the ideal free distribution  
475 in a spatially heterogeneous population. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 62:169–180,  
476 2002.
- 477 [16] S. Levins. Some demographic and genetic consequences of environmental heterogeneity  
478 for biological control. *Bulletin of the Entomological Society of America*, 15:237–240,  
479 1969.
- 480 [17] S. Levins. Extinction. In M. Gesternhaber, editor, *Some Mathematical Problems in*  
481 *Biology*, pages 77–107. American Mathematical Society, 1970.
- 482 [18] E. Lieberman, C. Hauert, and M.A. Nowak. Evolutionary dynamics on graphs. *Nature*,  
483 433:312–316, 2005.
- 484 [19] P.A.P. Moran. Random processes in genetics. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical*  
485 *Society*, 54:60–71, 1958.
- 486 [20] M.A. Nowak. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 314:1560–1563, 2006.
- 487 [21] M.A. Nowak and R.M. May. Evolutionary games and spatial chaos. *Nature*, 359:826,  
488 1992.
- 489 [22] H. Ohtsuki, C. Hauert, E. Lieberman, and M. A. Nowak. A simple rule for the evolution  
490 of cooperation on graphs and social networks. *Nature*, 441:502–505, 2006.
- 491 [23] H. Ohtsuki and M.A. Nowak. Evolutionary games on cycles. *Proceedings of the Royal*  
492 *Society B*, 273:2249–2256, 2006.

- 493 [24] H. Ohtsuki, J. Pacheco, and M. Nowak. Evolutionary graph theory: Breaking the sym-  
494 metry between interaction and replacement. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 246:681–  
495 694, 2007.
- 496 [25] R. Rogers and F. Willekens. The spatial reproductive value and the spatial momentum  
497 of zero population growth. *Environment and Planning A*, 10:5503–518, 1978.
- 498 [26] F. Rousset. *Genetic Structure and Selection in Subdivided Populations*. Princeton Uni-  
499 versity Press, 2004.
- 500 [27] F. Santos, M. Santos, and J. Pacheco. Social diversity promotes the emergence of  
501 cooperation in public goods games. *Nature*, 454:213–216, 2008.
- 502 [28] P.D. Taylor. Allele-frequency change in a class-structured population. *The American*  
503 *Naturalist*, 135:95–106, 1990.
- 504 [29] P.D. Taylor, T. Day, and G. Wild. From inclusive fitness to fixation probability in  
505 homogeneous structured populations. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 249:101–110, 2007.
- 506 [30] P.D. Taylor and S. Frank. How to make a kin-selection argument. *Journal of Theoretical*  
507 *Biology*, 180:27–37, 1996.
- 508 [31] G.H. Weiss and M. Kimura. A mathematical analysis of the stepping stone model of  
509 genetic correlation. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 2:129–149, 1965.
- 510 [32] S. Wright. Evolution in Mendelian populations. *Genetics*, 16:97–159, 1931.

## 511 **8 Appendix**

### 512 **8.1 Proof of Theorem 2 and 3**

513 I first prove Theorem 3 and then use this result in the proof of Theorem 2.

514 **Theorem 3.** *The neutral fixation probability  $\rho_{A|M}$  of a set  $M$  of  $A$  types on a graph  $G$*   
 515 *undergoing either a birth-death or death-birth Moran process is*

$$\rho_{A|M} = \sum_{i \in M} \rho_{A|i}. \quad (33)$$

516 *That is, the neutral fixation probability of a set of  $A$  types is the sum of the individual neutral*  
 517 *fixation probabilities.*

518 In preparation for this proof, define the *state* of the population to be the set of  $A$  types in  
 519 the population. For all states  $\mathcal{S}$ , the fixation probability  $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}$  of the set  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies the equation

$$\rho_{\mathcal{S}} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{S}} P_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}} \rho_{\mathcal{T}} + \left(1 - \sum_{\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{S}} P_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}\right) \rho_{\mathcal{S}}. \quad (34)$$

520 As an explicit instance of this equation, consider a well-mixed population of size  $N$ . The  
 521 states are precisely the number of  $A$  types. Equation (34) is then

$$\rho_i = P_{i,i+1} \rho_{i+1} + P_{i,i-1} \rho_{i-1} + (1 - P_{i,i+1} - P_{i,i-1}) \rho_i, \quad (35)$$

522 which is found elsewhere in the literature [20].

523 *Proof.* Considering all states of the population, Equation (34) is a system of equations. For  
 524 the initial conditions  $\rho_0 = 0$  and  $\rho_N = 1$ , where  $\rho_0$  is the state with no  $A$  types and  $\rho_N$  is the  
 525 state of all  $A$  types, then the system defined by Equation (34) has a unique solution up to  
 526 a non-zero constant. Hence, it suffices to show that Equation (33) satisfies these two initial  
 527 conditions and the system defined by Equation (34).

528 Clearly, Equation (33) satisfies the two initial conditions. To show that it satisfies the

529 system above, rewrite Equation (34) as

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{S}} P_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}} (\rho_{\mathcal{S}} - \rho_{\mathcal{T}}) = 0. \quad (36)$$

530 Note that the states  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  can differ by at most one vertex. For all other states,  $\mathcal{T}'$ ,  
 531  $P_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}'} = 0$ .

532 Denote the state obtained from state  $\mathcal{S}$  by switching the type of individual that occupies  
 533 vertex  $j$  by  $\mathcal{S}(j)$ . With this, Equation (36) is

$$\sum_j P_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}(j)} (\rho_{\mathcal{S}} - \rho_{\mathcal{S}(j)}) = 0. \quad (37)$$

534 I now substitute Equation (33) into the left-hand side of the above:

$$\sum_j P_{M, M(j)} (\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M(j)}) = 0. \quad (38)$$

535 Either  $j \in M$  or  $j \notin M$ . In the first case,

$$(\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M(j)}) = \rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M \setminus \{j\}}, \quad (39)$$

536 and in the second,

$$(\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M(j)}) = \rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M \cup \{j\}}. \quad (40)$$

537 At this point, I require an expression for  $P_{M, M(j)}$ . This will depend on whether a birth-death  
 538 or a death-birth process is being considered. For the birth-death process,

$$P_{M, M(j)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}'(j)} u_{kj}, \quad (41)$$

539 where the sum is taken over all neighbours of  $j$  that are a different type than  $j$ . Substituting  
 540 this into Equation (38) yields

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_j \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}'(j)} u_{kj} (\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M(j)}) \quad (42)$$

541

$$= \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{k \notin M} u_{kj} (\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M \setminus \{j\}}) + \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{k \notin M} u_{kj} (\rho_{A|M} - \rho_{A|M \cup \{j\}}) \right) = 0. \quad (43)$$

542 At this point, I directly substitute Equation (33) into Equation (43). With some simplifica-  
 543 tion, Equation (43) is

$$\frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{k \notin M} u_{kj} \rho_{A|j} + \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{k \notin M} u_{jk} (-\rho_{A|j}) \right) = \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{k \notin M} (u_{kj} - u_{kj}) \rho_{A|j} \right) = 0. \quad (44)$$

544 Hence, Equation (33) is a solution to Equation (34) and is, therefore, the desired probability.

545 □

546 The argument above can be described as follows. Every instance of a vertex  $j$  of  $M$  being  
 547 replaced by an individual  $k$  not in  $M$  exactly cancels with an instance of  $j$  replacing  $k$  to  
 548 create the set  $M \cup k$ .

549 The argmuent for the death-birth process is analogous. The only difference is that Equa-  
 550 tion (41) is

$$P_{M, M(j)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}'(j)} w_{kj}. \quad (45)$$

551 **Theorem 2.** *Let  $G$  be an evolutionary graph with  $N$  vertices and suppose the edges are*  
 552 *uniformly weighted. The fixation probability  $\rho_{A|i}$  of a single  $A$  type that emerges on vertex  $v_i$*

553 of  $G$  in the neutral population is

$$\rho_{A|i} = \frac{V_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N V_j}, \quad (46)$$

554 where  $V_i$  is the reproductive value of vertex  $v_i$ .

555 *Proof.* I consider a death-birth process; the result for the birth-death process is derived  
 556 analogously. A general proof that holds irrespective of the update rule can be derived from  
 557 the results of [15]. The proof of this theorem hinges on the Equation (34). The following  
 558 argument follows [3] where the authors prove a similar result for a birth-death process.

559 Similar to the previous proof,  $\rho_{A|i}$  satisfies

$$\rho_{A|i} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \rho_{A|\{ij\}} + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ji} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \right) \rho_{A|i}. \quad (47)$$

560 Rearranging yields

$$\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ji} \rho_{A|i} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} (\rho_{A|\{ij\}} - \rho_{A|i}). \quad (48)$$

561 From the Theorem 3, I have  $\rho_{A|\{ij\}} = \rho_{A|i} + \rho_{A|j}$ . Combining this with the fact that  $w_{ji} =$   
 562  $w_{ij} = 0$  for all non-adjacent  $i$  and  $j$ , Equation (48) is

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} w_{ji} \rho_{A|i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} w_{ij} \rho_{A|j}. \quad (49)$$

563 The solution for this is  $\rho_{A|i} = d_i$ . Normalizing by the sum of the degrees gives the result.

564 □