

# The SMC' is a highly accurate approximation to the ancestral recombination graph

Peter R. Wilton<sup>a,\*</sup>, Shai Carmi<sup>b,\*\*</sup>, Asger Hobolth<sup>c,\*\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Computer Science, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*Bioinformatics Research Centre, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark*

---

## Abstract

Two sequentially Markov coalescent models (SMC and SMC') are available as tractable approximations to the ancestral recombination graph (ARG). We present a model of coalescence at two fixed points along a pair of sequences evolving under the SMC'. Using our model, we derive a number of new quantities related to the pairwise SMC', thereby analytically quantifying for the first time the similarity between the SMC' and ARG. We use our model to show that the joint distribution of pairwise coalescence times at recombination sites under the SMC' is the same as it is marginally under the ARG, demonstrating that the SMC' is the canonical first-order sequentially Markov approximation to the pairwise ARG. Finally, we use these results to show that population size estimates under the pairwise SMC are asymptotically biased, while under the pairwise SMC' they are approximately asymptotically unbiased.

*Keywords:* Sequentially Markov coalescent, Ancestral recombination graph, consistency, ergodicity, Markov approximation

---

## 1. Introduction

Of the many models of genetic variation in the field of theoretical population genetics, few have as much relevance in the era of genomics as the ancestral recombination graph (ARG). The ancestral recombination graph models patterns of ancestry and genetic variation within sequences experiencing recombination under neutral conditions (HUDSON, 1991; GRIFFITHS and MARJORAM, 1997). Under the formulation of GRIFFITHS and MARJORAM (1997), lineages recombine apart and coalesce together back in time to produce a graph structure describing the ancestral genealogy at each point along a continuous chromosome. While only a few simple rules govern the process, many aspects of the model are analytically intractable.

WIUF and HEIN (1999) provided a formulation of the ARG that proceeds across the chromosome (rather than back in time), producing the genealogy at each point sequentially. As with the back-in-time formulation of GRIFFITHS and MARJORAM (1997), at each point along the chromosome there is a local genealogy describing the ancestry of the sample at that point, and changes in the genealogy occur at points where recombination events have occurred. In this sequential formulation of the ARG, a new lineage is produced wherever an ancestral recombination event is encountered along the chromosome. To produce a new genealogy at the recombination site, the new lineage is coalesced to the ARG representing the ancestry of all previous points along the chromosome. This dependence on all previous points makes the process non-Markovian and is one of the properties of the ARG that makes it often intractable.

Approximations to the ARG have been suggested with the goal of modeling coalescence with recombination in a way that is analytically tractable. MCVEAN and CARDIN (2005) introduced the *sequentially Markov coalescent* (SMC). The original formulation of the SMC was a sequential model, generating genealogies along the chromosome such that each new genealogy depends only on the previous genealogy. Like the ARG, the SMC has both a back-in-time formulation and a sequential formulation. The back-in-time

---

\*Corresponding author

\*\*Contributed equally to this work

*Email address:* [pwilton@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:pwilton@fas.harvard.edu) (Peter R. Wilton)

formulation of the SMC is equivalent to that of the ARG except that coalescence is allowed only between lineages containing overlapping ancestral material. As a consequence, in the sequential formulation of the pairwise ( $n = 2$  chromosomes) SMC, each recombination event produces a new pairwise coalescence time.

MARJORAM and WALL (2006) introduced a slight modification to the SMC, termed the SMC', which retains the Markov behavior along the chromosome but models additional coalescence events that make it a closer approximation to the ARG. Specifically, in the back-in-time formulation of the SMC', coalescence is allowed between lineages containing either overlapping *or adjacent* ancestral material. In the sequential formulation of the pairwise SMC', this means that not every recombination event necessarily produces a change in local coalescence time, since two lineages created by a recombination event can coalesce back together. Figure 1 shows the transitions that are permitted under the back-in-time and sequential formulations of the pairwise ARG, SMC, and SMC'. The sequentially Markov coalescent models have been used in many recently introduced population-genetic, model-based inference procedures, including the pairwise SMC (PSMC) model (LI and DURBIN, 2011), multiple SMC (MSMC) model (SCHIFFELS and DURBIN, 2014), diCal (SHEEHAN *et al.*, 2013), coalHMM (HOBOLTH *et al.*, 2007; DUTHEIL *et al.*, 2009), and ARGWeaver (RASMUSSEN *et al.*, 2014).




Figure 1: Transitions permitted under the ARG, SMC', and SMC models. Under “Sequential Transitions,” a transition occurs from left to right across the chromosome at the rightmost recombination event. Locations of recombination events are marked with red lines along the horizontal axis, and the  $i$ th coalescence time is labeled as  $t_i$ . Under “Back-in-time transitions,” the arrow indicates a coalescence event that occurs between two aligned chromosomes, each carrying a combination of ancestral (solid black line) and non-ancestral material (dashed gray line). Ancestral material is defined as a portion of a chromosome that is ancestral to the sample.

The SMC' was shown by simulation to produce measurements of linkage disequilibrium more similar to the ARG than those produced by the SMC (MARJORAM and WALL, 2006; CARMi *et al.*, 2014). Few other comparisons between these models have been made, and analytical results for the SMC' are few. Here, we propose a model for generating pairwise coalescence times at two fixed points along continuous chromosomes modeled by the SMC'. Through analysis of this model, we calculate for the first time many statistical

properties of the pairwise SMC' and compare these against those of the ARG and SMC. Specifically, for each model of coalescence with recombination, we compare the following properties of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , the joint distribution of pairwise coalescence times at two fixed points: the joint density  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t_1, t_2)$  (Section 2.2), the conditional density  $f_{T_2|T_1}(t_2|t_1)$  (Section 2.3), the probability  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  that the pairwise coalescence times are the same (Section 2.4), and the covariance  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$  between the coalescence times (Section 2.5). These quantities are readily related to measures of linkage disequilibrium in real sequence data.

Using our two-locus model of the pairwise SMC', we also show that the joint distribution of coalescence times immediately to the left and right of a recombination event is the same under the SMC' and ARG. This allows us to calculate the asymptotic bias of the pairwise SMC- and SMC'-based population-size estimators, which we confirm by simulation. We show that the SMC' estimator is approximately asymptotically unbiased.

## 2. Results

### 2.1. Two-locus Markov chain models

We first present two-locus, back-in-time formulations (as opposed to sequential, across-the-chromosome formulations) of the ARG, SMC, and SMC' models, beginning with the previously described ARG and SMC because these models are simpler and provide context for the presentation of the SMC'. KAPLAN and HUDSON (1985) described how the process of generating coalescence times at two linked loci modeled by the ARG can be represented as a continuous-time Markov chain, with coalescence and recombination events causing transitions between states. SIMONSEN and CHURCHILL (1997) explored this process further for the case where the sample size is  $n = 2$  and derived for the ARG many of the quantities we compare against the SMC' in this paper.

If time is scaled such that the rate of coalescence is one and the total rate of recombination between the two linked loci is  $\rho/2$ , then the two-locus ancestral process under the ARG is the model depicted in Fig. 2A. The process starts in state  $\mathbf{R}_0$  with two lineages, each containing linked copies of the two loci. From  $\mathbf{R}_0$ , the process transitions with rate  $\rho$  to state  $\mathbf{R}_1$ , in which one of the two chromosomes has experienced a recombination event, or to state  $\mathbf{C}_B$ , in which both loci have coalesced, terminating the process. From  $\mathbf{R}_1$ , a recombination event on the remaining linked chromosome (occurring with rate  $\rho/2$ ) can take the process to  $\mathbf{R}_2$ , in which neither locus has coalesced and all focal-locus copies are unlinked, or to  $\mathbf{C}_L$  or  $\mathbf{C}_R$ , in which the left and right focal loci have coalesced, respectively.

Unlike previous descriptions of two-locus continuous-time Markov chains (SIMONSEN and CHURCHILL, 1997; HOBOLTH and JENSEN, 2014), we disregard any information about linkage between the two loci after one locus has coalesced, since the rate of coalescence at the uncoalesced locus is 1 regardless of the state of linkage with the coalesced locus. In general, the rate of coalescence between each pair of lineages containing uncoalesced ancestral material is 1, and the rate of recombination, breaking apart linked loci back in time, is  $\rho/2$  multiplied by the number of lineages containing linked loci.

The defining feature of the SMC is that ancestral lineages not containing overlapping ancestral material cannot coalesce (MCVEAN and CARDIN, 2005). For the back-in-time formulation of the SMC, the consequence of restricting coalescence in this way is that once a recombination event occurs between the two loci, the process can never return to the fully-linked, uncoalesced state ( $\mathbf{R}_0$ ) and the remaining time until coalescence at the two loci can be modeled as independent exponential random variables with rate 1 (Fig. 2B). This suggests a natural representation of the joint distribution of  $(T_1, T_2)$  under the SMC:

$$(T_1, T_2) \sim (X_0 + RX_L, X_0 + RX_R), \quad (1)$$

where  $X_0 \sim \text{Exp}(1 + \rho)$  is the amount of time to leave  $\mathbf{R}_0$ ,  $R \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{\rho}{1+\rho})$  indicates whether the first event is a recombination event, and  $X_L \sim X_R \sim \text{Exp}(1)$  are the exponential waiting times until coalescence after the first recombination event. All of these random variables are independent in the SMC model, so it is straightforward to calculate many of the quantities we compare in this paper using this representation.

The defining rule of the SMC' model of coalescence with recombination is that only ancestral lineages containing overlapping *or contiguous* ancestral material can coalesce (MARJORAM and WALL, 2006). The back-in-time model of coalescence at two fixed loci under this model is the Markov jump chain shown in Figure 3. Under the SMC', it is necessary to model the number of recombination events that have occurred between the two loci at each point in time. To see that this is the case, consider the state  $\mathbf{R}_2$

in Figure 3. In this state, two recombination events have occurred between the focal loci, and neither focal locus has coalesced. Because lineages can only coalesce to lineages containing overlapping or adjacent ancestral material, two particular coalescence events would need to occur before the process returns to state  $\mathbf{R}_0$ , regardless of the placement of the recombination events on the two chromosomes. This model also features an additional state  $\mathbf{I}$ , which is entered when some portion of the chromosome between the focal loci coalesces prior to either of the focal loci. Upon entering  $\mathbf{I}$  it becomes impossible for the process to re-enter the initial, fully-linked state ( $\mathbf{R}_0$ ), so the remaining times until coalescence at the focal loci become independent exponential random variables with mean 1. If  $\mathbf{R}_i$  is the state in which neither focal locus has coalesced and  $i$  recombination events have occurred between the focal loci, the transition rate into  $\mathbf{I}$  is  $i - 1$ . This is due to the fact that each recombination event after the first produces an additional pair of lineages that can coalesce to take the process to  $\mathbf{I}$ . For each state  $\mathbf{R}_i$ ,  $i \geq 1$ , the number of lineages that can coalesce to take the process to  $\mathbf{R}_{i-1}$  is  $i$ , and the rate of transitioning to  $\mathbf{R}_{i+1}$  through recombination is  $\rho$ . As with the ARG and SMC, transitions to  $\mathbf{C}_L$  and  $\mathbf{C}_R$  occur at rate 1 whenever the process is in state  $\mathbf{R}_i$ ,  $i \geq 1$ .




Figure 2: **A)** Schematic of the ARG back-in-time Markov process for two loci. **B)** Schematic of the SMC back-in-time Markov jump chain for two loci. In both cases the process starts in state  $\mathbf{R}_0$  and transitions to other states occur with the rates indicated by arrows between states.

## 2.2. Joint probability density functions

For the ARG, SMC, and SMC', let  $R_0(t)$  represent the probability that the two-locus ancestral coalescent process is in state  $\mathbf{R}_0$  at time  $t$ , and let  $R^+(t)$  represent the probability that the process is in any state  $\mathbf{R}_i$  at time  $t$ , where  $i \geq 1$  (including  $\mathbf{I}$  for the SMC'). For the three coalescent models we compare here, the general form of the joint density of coalescence times at the two focal loci is

$$f_{T_1, T_2}(t_1, t_2) = \begin{cases} R_0(t_1) & t_1 = t_2 \\ R^+(t_1)e^{-(t_2-t_1)} & t_1 < t_2 \\ R^+(t_2)e^{-(t_1-t_2)} & t_1 > t_2. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

For the ARG and the SMC, the number of states is finite and  $R_0(t)$  and  $R^+(t)$  can be solved using matrix exponentiation. For the SMC', there are an infinite number of states, representing the possibility of an infinite number of recombination events occurring between the two focal loci. To solve for the probability




Figure 3: Schematic of the SMC' back-in-time Markov jump chain for two loci. Dashed arrows show transition rates that apply for all  $\mathbf{R}_i$ . State  $\mathbf{I}$  is the state in which some portion of the chromosome between the two focal loci has coalesced but neither focal locus has coalesced. The red lines in states  $\mathbf{R}_2$  and  $\mathbf{R}_3$  show the coalescence events that take the process to state  $\mathbf{I}$ .

$R_j(t)$  that the SMC' process is in state  $\mathbf{R}_j$  at time  $t$ , one can use the forward Kolmogorov equation (for  $i \geq 1$ )

$$R_j'(t) = \rho R_{j-1}(t) + (j+1)R_{j+1}(t) - (2j+1+\rho)R_j(t). \quad (3)$$

Through substitution, the solution to (3) can be shown to be

$$R_j(t) = R_0(t) \frac{\left[\frac{\rho}{2}(1 - e^{-2t})\right]^j}{j!}. \quad (4)$$

To find  $R_0(t)$ , we note that it is equal to  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t, t)$  (see Eq. (2)). In turn,  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t, t) = f_{T_1}(t)P(T_2 = t|T_1 = t)$ , where  $f_{T_1}(t) = e^{-t}$  is the marginal distribution of coalescence times at the first (or second) locus and  $P(T_2 = t|T_1 = t) = e^{-\rho\lambda(t)}$  is the probability of no change in coalescence times given the coalescence time  $t$  at the first locus. Here  $\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - e^{-2t} + 2t)$  is the exponential rate of encountering a change in coalescence time along the chromosome given that the local coalescence time is  $t$  (CARMÍ *et al.*, 2014). Thus  $R_0(t)$  is given by

$$R_0(t) = e^{-t} e^{-\rho\lambda(t)}. \quad (5)$$

This completes the solution of  $R_j(t)$ . Using Figure 3,

$$R^+(t) = I(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} R_j(t), \quad (6)$$

where  $I(t)$  is the probability that the process is in state  $I$  at time  $t$ . Using (4) and (5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} R_j(t) &= R_0(t) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left[\frac{\rho}{2}(1 - e^{-2t})\right]^j}{j!} \\ &= e^{-t} e^{-\frac{\rho}{4}(1+2t-e^{-2t})} \left[ e^{\frac{\rho}{2}(1-e^{-2t})} - 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Next,  $I(t)$  satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation

$$I'(t) = \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} (j-1)R_j(t) - 2I(t), \quad (8)$$

the solution to which is

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) &= e^{-2t} \int_0^t e^{2u} \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} (j-1)R_j(u) du \\ &= e^{-2t} \int_0^t R_0(u) \left\{ 2e^{2u} + e^{\frac{\rho}{2}(1-e^{-2u})} [(\rho-2)e^{2u} - \rho] \right\} du \\ &= e^{-2t} \left\{ 1 - e^{\frac{1}{4}(-2t(\rho-2) + \rho - e^{-2t}\rho)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - e^{-\frac{\rho}{4}} 2^{\frac{\rho-4}{2}} (-\rho)^{-\frac{\rho-2}{4}} \left[ \Gamma\left(\frac{\rho-2}{4}, -\frac{\rho}{4}\right) - \Gamma\left(\frac{\rho-2}{4}, -\frac{e^{-2t}\rho}{4}\right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here,  $\Gamma(a, b) = \int_b^{\infty} x^{a-1} e^{-x} dx$  is the incomplete gamma function.

Together (5), (6), (7), and (9) give the joint distribution (2) for the SMC'. For the ARG and SMC, the expressions for  $R_0(t)$  and  $R^+(t)$  in the joint distribution (2) can be obtained by exponentiating the rate matrices implicit in Figure 2. For the SMC, the joint distribution can also be derived using the representation (1).

Figure 4 compares the joint coalescence time distributions under the SMC and SMC', displaying the differences of these joint distributions with the joint distribution of the ARG. The SMC' provides a much better fit to the ARG joint distribution for the range of recombination rates compared. Both the SMC and the SMC' underestimate the density of outcomes where  $T_1 = T_2$ , but this underestimation is substantially less under the SMC'.

To summarize the difference between the joint distributions more precisely, we calculated the total varia-




Figure 4: Comparison of the difference in joint density of coalescence times  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t_1, t_2)$  between the SMC and ARG (top row) and SMC' and ARG (bottom row). Comparisons are made for three different rates of recombination between the two focal loci ( $\rho = 0.1, 1.0, 5.0$ ).

tion distance between the SMC and ARG and between the SMC' and ARG across a range of recombination rates. The total variation distance between the SMC and the ARG is defined as

$$TV(\text{SMC}, \text{ARG}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |f^{\text{SMC}}(t_1, t_2) - f^{\text{ARG}}(t_1, t_2)| dt_2 dt_1, \quad (10)$$

where  $f^{\text{SMC}}(t_1, t_2)$  and  $f^{\text{ARG}}(t_1, t_2)$  are the joint densities  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t_1, t_2)$  defined under the SMC and ARG, respectively. The total variation distance between the SMC' and ARG is similarly defined. Figure 5 shows the total variation distance from the ARG for the SMC and SMC' over a range of recombination rates. Total variation distances were calculated numerically. For both the SMC and SMC', the total variation distance was maximized at some intermediate recombination rate, approximately  $\rho = 1.1$  for the SMC and  $\rho = 3.2$  for the SMC'.

It is interesting to note that the walk on the states  $\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots$ , constitutes a birth-death process with killing, where birth events correspond to additional recombination events taking the process from  $\mathbf{R}_i$  to  $\mathbf{R}_{i+1}$ , death events correspond to coalescence events that take the process from  $\mathbf{R}_i$  to  $\mathbf{R}_{i-1}$ , and killing events, which take the process to an absorbing state, here correspond to coalescence events that take the process to  $\mathbf{C}_L, \mathbf{C}_R$ , or  $\mathbf{I}$ . Under this formulation, the birth rate is constant  $\lambda_i = \rho$ , the death rate is linear  $\mu_i = i$ , and the killing rate is linear  $\gamma_i = i + 1$ . This class of processes was studied by VAN DOORN and ZEIFMAN (2005), who demonstrated a different approach for calculating  $R_i(t)$ . This alternative approach (not shown) confirms our derivation of (5).

### 2.3. Conditional distribution of coalescence times

In this section we consider the distribution of coalescence times at one locus given the coalescence time at the other. The conditional density of  $T_2$  given  $T_1$ ,  $f_{T_2|T_1}(t_2|t_1)$ , can be calculated by dividing the joint distribution  $f_{T_1, T_2}(t_2, t_1)$  by  $e^{-t_1}$ , the marginal distribution of coalescence times at the left locus:

$$f_{T_2|T_1}(t_2|t_1) = \frac{f_{T_1, T_2}(t_1, t_2)}{e^{-t_1}}. \quad (11)$$




Figure 5: Total variation distance between the SMC and ARG (solid line) and the SMC' and ARG (dashed line) as a function of recombination rate. Total variation distances were calculated numerically.

HOBOLTH and JENSEN (2014) introduced a framework for modeling the distribution of  $T_2$  given  $T_1$  using a time-inhomogeneous continuous-time Markov chain. (Note that the model called SMC' in HOBOLTH and JENSEN (2014) is an SMC'-like model of two loci that is not based on the continuous-chromosome SMC'. It is different from the SMC' model we consider here.) This framework can be extended to the SMC', producing the continuous-time Markov chain shown in Figure 6. Within this framework, a coalescence time  $T_2$  at the right locus is generated back in time conditioned upon a coalescence time  $T_1$  at the left locus.

Figure 7 compares the conditional density  $f_{T_2|T_1}(t_2|t_1)$  of coalescence times  $t_2$  at the right locus conditioned upon the coalescence times  $t_1$  at the left locus for different values of  $t_1$  and recombination rate  $\rho$ . The conditional density under the SMC' is much closer to the density produced by the ARG than is the conditional density under the SMC.

#### 2.4. Probability of coalescence times being equal

In the two-locus, back-in-time ancestral models,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are equal when the state  $\mathbf{C}_B$  is entered through  $\mathbf{R}_0$  rather than  $\mathbf{C}_L$  or  $\mathbf{C}_R$ . That is, the coalescence times are equal when a coalescence event occurs between two ancestral lineages each carrying ancestral material at both of the focal loci. The probability  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  can be obtained by analyzing the ancestral processes introduced in Section 2.1. For the SMC and SMC',  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  can also be obtained by considering the original, sequential formulations of McVEAN and CARDIN (2005) and MARJORAM and WALL (2006), respectively.

For the ARG, SIMONSEN and CHURCHILL (1997) showed that the probability that  $T_1$  is equal to  $T_2$  is

$$P_{\text{ARG}}(T_1 = T_2) = \frac{\rho + 18}{\rho^2 + 13\rho + 18}. \quad (12)$$

Under the SMC, representation (1) shows that

$$P_{\text{SMC}}(T_1 = T_2) = \frac{1}{1 + \rho}. \quad (13)$$

Under the SMC', the probability that  $T_1$  is equal to  $T_2$  is most easily obtained by considering the sequential formulation of CARMÍ *et al.* (2014). Under this formulation, when the local coalescence time is  $t$ , the distance until a change in the coalescence time (measured in units of the scaled recombination parameter  $\rho$ ) is exponentially distributed with rate parameter  $\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - e^{-2t} + 2t)$ , as above. Thus






Figure 6: Back-in-time Markov jump chain for generating a coalescence time  $T_2$  at the right locus conditional on the time  $T_1 = t_1$  at the left locus under the SMC'. Starting at time zero in state  $R_0$ , the process follows the transitions indicated by the solid arrows at the rates accompanying these arrows. Transitions indicated by dotted arrows are followed instantaneously at time  $t_1$ . See HOBOLTH and JENSEN (2014) for analogous processes for the ARG and SMC models.




Figure 7: Comparison of densities of coalescence times  $t_2$  at the right locus conditional upon coalescence times  $t_1$  at the left locus. Conditional densities  $f_{T_2|T_1}(t_2|t_1)$  are shown for the ARG, SMC, and SMC' models for three different rates of recombination between the two loci ( $\rho = 0.1, 1.0, 5.0$ ) and three different conditioned-upon coalescence times  $t_1$  at the left locus ( $t_1 = 0.1, 1.0, 4.0$ ). The area under each curve is  $P(T_2 \neq t_1 | T_1 = t_1)$ ; the conditional probabilities  $P(T_2 = t_1 | T_1 = t_1)$  are not shown.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\text{SMC}'}(T_1 = T_2) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{-\rho \lambda(t)} dt \\
 &= 2^{\rho/2} e^{-\rho/4} (-\rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\rho}{4} \left[ \Gamma\left(\frac{2+\rho}{4}\right) - \Gamma\left(\frac{2+\rho}{4}, -\frac{\rho}{4}\right) \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The first line in (14) follows from the fact that the marginal distribution of coalescence times at the left locus is  $e^{-t}$ , and given the left coalescence time  $t$ , the probability that the same coalescence time extends a distance at least  $\rho$  to the right is  $e^{-\rho\lambda(t)}$ . This equation was also derived by ERIKSSON *et al.* (2009) using a similar approach (see their Eq. (10)). Figure 8 compares  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  for the ARG, SMC, and SMC'.

### 2.5. Covariance of coalescence times

The covariance between coalescence times,  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$ , is a measure of the dependence between coalescence times and is informative about the scale over which features of the genome become independent. Under the ARG,

$$\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] = \frac{\rho + 18}{\rho^2 + 13\rho + 18} \quad (15)$$

(GRIFFITHS, 1981; HUDSON and KAPLAN, 1985). Under the SMC,

$$\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] = \frac{1}{1 + \rho} \quad (16)$$

(MCVEAN and CARDIN, 2005).

For both the ARG and the SMC,  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  is equal to  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$ . This can be shown to hold in general for two-locus coalescence models where the marginal distribution of coalescence times is Exponential with rate 1. Using the definition of covariance:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] &= \text{E}[T_1 T_2] - \text{E}[T_1] \text{E}[T_2] \\ &= \text{E}[T_1 T_2] - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The expectation  $\text{E}[T_1 T_2]$  can be derived using the fact that  $(a - b)^2 = a^2 + b^2 - 2ab$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 2\text{E}[T_1 T_2] &= \text{E}[T_1^2] + \text{E}[T_2^2] - \text{E}[(T_1 - T_2)^2] \\ &= 2 + 2 - \text{E}[(T_1 - T_2)^2 | T_1 \neq T_2] P(T_1 \neq T_2) \\ &= 4 - 2P(T_1 \neq T_2). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The final equality in (18) follows from the fact that  $|T_1 - T_2|$  has an Exponential distribution with rate 1 when  $T_1 \neq T_2$ . Therefore  $\text{E}[T_1 T_2] = 2 - P(T_1 \neq T_2)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] &= \text{E}[T_1 T_2] - 1 \\ &= 2 - P(T_1 \neq T_2) - 1 \\ &= 1 - P(T_1 \neq T_2) \\ &= P(T_1 = T_2). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Thus Figure 8 compares both  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  and  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$  under the ARG, SMC, and SMC'.

OHTA and KIMURA (1971) introduced the approximation

$$\sigma_d^2 = \frac{\text{E}[D]}{\text{E}[p_1(1 - p_1)p_2(1 - p_2)]} \quad (20)$$

of the linkage disequilibrium measure

$$r^2 = \text{E} \left[ \frac{D}{p_1(1 - p_1)p_2(1 - p_2)} \right], \quad (21)$$

where  $D = p_{12} - p_1 p_2$  is the standard measure of linkage disequilibrium at two partially linked loci,  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are allele frequencies at the two loci, and  $p_{12}$  is the frequency of gametes carrying both of the alleles

represented by  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . MCVEAN (2002) showed that  $\sigma_d^2$  could be expressed in terms of the covariances of coalescence times:

$$\sigma_d^2 = \frac{C_{ij,ij} - 2C_{ij,ik} + C_{ij,kl}}{C_{ij,kl} + 1}. \quad (22)$$

Here  $C_{ij,kl} = \text{Cov}[T_1^{(ij)}, T_2^{(kl)}]$  is the covariance of the coalescence time at the first locus sampled from haplotypes  $i$  and  $j$  and the coalescence time at the second locus sampled from haplotypes  $k$  and  $l$ . The above proof that  $P(T_1 = T_2) = \text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$  applies to  $C_{ij,kl}$  as well, regardless of whether  $i$  is the same as  $k$  or  $j$  is the same as  $l$ , since the marginal coalescence time at a single locus is still Exponentially distributed with rate 1 regardless of the initial configuration. We were unable to solve for these probabilities under both the SMC and SMC'.

In order to calculate the necessary covariances, MCVEAN and CARDIN (2005) used the simplifying assumption that all recombination occurred at the same point between the two loci. We note that this assumption makes the SMC' equivalent to the ARG. MARJORAM and WALL (2006) simulated mean values of  $r^2$  at different genomic distances under the ARG, SMC', and SMC, showing that the SMC' is more similar to the ARG in mean  $r^2$  values than was the SMC.




Figure 8: Comparison of  $P(T_1 = T_2)$  for the ARG, SMC, and SMC'. For these three models, this probability is equal to  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$  (see text).

### 2.5.1. Covariance of coalescence times when $\rho$ is small

It is interesting to consider  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] = P(T_1 = T_2)$  when  $\rho$  is small. For the ARG, consideration of (12) shows that  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] = P_{\text{ARG}}(T_1 = T_2) = 1 - 2\rho/3 + O(\rho^2)$ . Likewise, for the SMC, (13) shows that  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] = P_{\text{SMC}}(T_1 = T_2) = 1 - \rho + O(\rho^2)$ . For the SMC', the integral representation of  $P_{\text{SMC}'}(T_1 = T_2)$  in (14) allows for the calculation of this quantity as a first-order expansion in  $\rho$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2] &= P_{\text{SMC}'}(T_1 = T_2) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{-\rho\lambda(t)} dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} [1 - \lambda(t)\rho + O(\rho^2)] dt \\
&= 1 - \rho \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \lambda(t) dt + O(\rho^2) \\
&= 1 - \frac{2\rho}{3} + O(\rho^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Thus,  $\text{Cov}[T_1, T_2]$  (or  $P(T_1 = T_2)$ ) is the same up to order  $\rho^2$  under the ARG and SMC'.

### 2.6. Coalescence times at recombination sites

In this section, we show that the joint distribution of coalescence times on either side of a recombination event is the same under the SMC' and marginally under the ARG, and we derive this distribution. Consider the continuous-time Markov chains representing the two-locus ARG and SMC' models (Figs. 2A and 3, respectively) in the limit  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  and conditioning on the first event being a recombination event. These models represent the joint distribution of coalescence times on either side of a recombination event under the ARG and SMC'. In both of these conditional continuous-time Markov chains, the waiting time until the first event, conditional on that event being a recombination event, has an exponential distribution with rate  $1 + \rho$ , which converges to 1 as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ . After that first recombination event, the rate of all additional recombination events converges to zero in the  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  limit, so all of the remaining events must be coalescence events, each of which occurs with rate 1. Under the ARG and the SMC', the coalescence events that are possible from state  $\mathbf{R}_1$  are the same. Thus, the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites is the same under the SMC' and the ARG.

Figure 9A shows the two-locus continuous-time Markov chain representing this conditional process representing coalescence times on either side of a recombination event under the ARG and SMC'. This Markov chain starts in a special initial state  $\mathbf{R}_0^*$ , out of which the first event is always a recombination event, which happens with rate 1, as described above. In previous sections, we used  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  to represent the coalescence times at two loci some fixed distance apart. To avoid confusion, in this section we use  $S$  and  $T$  to represent the coalescence times on the left and right sides of a recombination event, respectively.

Recombination events are visible in sequence data only if they change the local coalescence time. Thus, it is of special interest to condition on  $S \neq T$  in the above model in order to derive the joint distribution of coalescence times on either side of a change in coalescence times under the ARG and SMC'. Conditioning on  $S \neq T$ , the transition out of  $\mathbf{R}_1$  must be into either  $\mathbf{C}_L$  or  $\mathbf{C}_R$ . These transitions occur with conditional rate  $3/2$ , since the total rate of leaving  $\mathbf{R}_1$  is three in the unconditional model, and two of the ways of leaving  $\mathbf{R}_1$  result in the coalescence times being different.

The model representing coalescence times on either side of a change in coalescence times (i.e., where at recombination sites where  $S \neq T$ ) is shown in Figure 9B. Under this model, the joint distribution of  $S$  and  $T$  is that of

$$(S, T) \sim (X_1 + X_2 + RX_3, X_1 + X_2 + (1 - R)X_3), \tag{24}$$

where  $X_1 \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ ,  $X_2 \sim \text{Exp}(3)$ ,  $R \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1/2)$ ,  $X_3 \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ , and each random variable is independently distributed. The joint density function of  $S$  and  $T$  under this model is

$$f_{S,T}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{4} (1 - e^{-2s}) e^{-t} & s < t \\ \frac{3}{4} (1 - e^{-2t}) e^{-s} & s > t, \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

and the marginal density function of  $S$  (or  $T$ ) is

$$\pi(s) = \frac{3}{8} e^{-s} (2s + 1 - e^{-2s}). \tag{26}$$

The conditional distribution of  $T$  given  $S$  is

$$f_{T|S}(t|s) = \frac{f_{S,T}(s,t)}{\pi(s)} = \begin{cases} \frac{2(1-e^{-2t})}{1-e^{-2s}+2s} & t < s \\ \frac{2e^{-(t-s)}(1-e^{-2s})}{1-e^{-2s}+2s} & t > s. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Equations (25), (26), and (27) hold marginally at recombination sites where the coalescence time changes under both the ARG and SMC'. Equations (26) and (27) were derived for the SMC' by CARMÍ *et al.* (2014, see eqns. (8) and (9), respectively), confirming our derivation here.

Note that the model representing the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites under the SMC is equivalent to the model in Figure 9B with the transition rates from  $\mathbf{R}_1$  to  $\mathbf{C}_L$  and  $\mathbf{C}_R$  equal to 1 instead of 3/2. Under this model for the SMC, the joint distribution of coalescence times on either side of a recombination event is that of

$$(S, T) \sim (X_1 + X_2, X_1 + X_3), \quad (28)$$

where  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $X_3$  are all mutually independent exponential random variables with rate 1. The joint density of  $S$  and  $T$  under the SMC is

$$f_{S,T}(s,t) = \begin{cases} e^{-t}(1-e^{-s}) & s < t \\ e^{-s}(1-e^{-t}) & s > t \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

and the marginal density of  $S$  (or  $T$ ) is

$$\pi(s) = se^{-s}. \quad (30)$$

Under the SMC, the conditional distribution of  $T$  given  $S$  is

$$f_{T|S}(t|s) = \frac{f_{S,T}(s,t)}{\pi(s)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1-e^{-t}}{s} & t < s \\ \frac{e^{-(t-s)}(1-e^{-s})}{s} & t > s, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

which confirms the derivation of LI and DURBIN (2011, cf. their Eq. (S6)).

### 2.6.1. SMC' as canonical first-order Markov approximation to ARG

Under the sequential formulation of each model considered here, the infinitesimal probability of a recombination event occurring in the interval  $(x, x + dx)$  given the coalescence time  $s$  at  $x$  is  $s dx$ . This fact, together with the fact that the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites is the same under the ARG and SMC' (whether or not the coalescence time changes), implies that the conditional distribution of coalescence times at point  $x + dx$  given the coalescence time at point  $x$  is the same under the SMC' and ARG.

This result demonstrates that the pairwise SMC' is the canonical first-order Markov approximation to the pairwise ARG. Given an infinite-order Markov chain  $\{X_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , where the distribution of each  $X_j$  depends on all previous  $X_i, i < j$ , the canonical  $k$ -order Markov approximation to  $\{X_i\}$  is the Markov chain  $\{X_i^{[k]}\}$  satisfying

$$P(X_n^{[k]} | X_{n-1}^{[k]} = x_{n-1}, \dots, X_{n-k}^{[k]} = x_{n-k}) = P(X_n | X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, \dots, X_{n-k} = x_{n-k}). \quad (32)$$

That is, the transition probabilities under the  $k$ -order canonical Markov approximation are equal to the transition probabilities conditional on the previous  $k$  states under the infinite-order chain. See SCHWARZ (1976), FERNÁNDEZ and GALVES (2002), and GALLO *et al.* (2013) for examples of mathematical studies of canonical Markov approximations of infinite-order Markov chains.

Here we informally extend the terminology of canonical Markov approximations to continuous processes. The SMC' is the canonical first-order Markov approximation to the ARG because the distribution of coalescence times at  $x + dx$  conditional on the coalescence time at  $x$  is the same under the ARG (an infinite-order,

sequentially non-Markovian continuous process) and the SMC' (a first-order sequentially Markov continuous process).




Figure 9: Two-locus continuous-time Markov chains representing the ARG and SMC' models in the  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  limit, conditional on the first event being a recombination event. These models represent the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites in the ARG and SMC'. The state  $R_0^*$  represents a special starting state out of which the first event is always a recombination event. Panel A shows the process unconditional on whether  $S = T$ , and Panel B shows the process conditional on  $S \neq T$ . The model representing the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites under the SMC is equivalent to the model in Panel B with the transition rates from  $R_1$  to  $C_L$  and  $C_R$  equal to 1 instead of  $3/2$ .

### 2.7. Asymptotic bias of the population-size estimators under SMC and SMC'

Given the joint density of pairwise coalescence times at recombination sites under the ARG, it is possible to determine the asymptotic bias of maximum-likelihood estimators of population size derived from the pairwise SMC and SMC' likelihood functions. These likelihood functions give the probability of observing a sequence of pairwise coalescence times and corresponding segment lengths across a chromosome under the SMC and SMC' models. Related likelihood functions (allowing for variable historical population size) are implicitly maximized in the PSMC and MSMC inference procedures (LI and DURBIN, 2011; SCHIFFELS and DURBIN, 2014, respectively). These inference procedures are hidden Markov model (HMM) methods in which the local coalescence times (or genealogies) and segment lengths are hidden states inferred from sequence data. Here, we consider the estimators that would be obtained if the hidden states in these models were actually observable (see also KIM *et al.*, 2014). We are motivated by the fact that any properties of the estimators we consider here are likely to be properties of the full HMM-based inference procedures.

To investigate the asymptotic properties of these estimators, we assume that data are generated under the ARG, such that at a fixed point the distribution of pairwise coalescence times is exponential with rate equal to 1 and an ancestral segment of length  $l$  recombines back in time at rate  $\rho l/2$ . Here, segment lengths are measured in units of the true scaled recombination parameter  $\rho$ . Data generated under this model can be represented as a sequence of pairwise coalescence times and corresponding segment lengths:  $\{(t_i, l_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ .

We are interested in estimating a single relative population size  $\eta$  (defined relative to the true population size,  $N$ ), which must be incorporated into the transition density function  $q(t|s)$  at recombination sites under

the SMC and SMC'. Under the SMC, this transition density function is

$$q_{\text{SMC}}(t|s; \eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{s}(1 - e^{-t/\eta}) & t < s \\ \frac{1}{s}e^{-(t-s)/\eta}(1 - e^{-s/\eta}) & t > s. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

This is equivalent to the conditional density (31) above with the addition of a relative population size parameter. Under the SMC', the transition function is

$$q_{\text{SMC}'}(t|s; \eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{2}{\eta}(1 - e^{-2t/\eta})}{1 + \frac{2s}{\eta} - e^{-2s}} & t < s \\ \frac{\frac{2}{\eta}e^{-(t-s)/\eta}(1 - e^{-2s/\eta})}{1 + \frac{2s}{\eta} - e^{-2s}} & t > s, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

which is equivalent to the conditional density (27) with a relative population size parameter included.

Under the SMC, given the local coalescence time  $t$ , the distance along the chromosome until the nearest recombination event (measured in units of  $\rho$ ) is exponentially distributed with rate  $t$  (MCVEAN and CARDIN, 2005). The likelihood function for a single relative population size  $\eta$  under the SMC is thus

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{SMC}}(\eta|\{(t_i, l_i)\}) &= \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i|t_{i-1}; \eta) \prod_{i=1}^k t_i e^{-t_i l_i} \\ &\propto \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i|t_{i-1}; \eta). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Under the SMC', the likelihood function for a relative population size  $\eta$  is

$$L_{\text{SMC}'}(\eta|\{(t_i, l_i)\}) = \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}'}(t_i|t_{i-1}; \eta) \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda(t_i, \eta) e^{-\lambda(t_i, \eta) l_i}, \quad (36)$$

where  $\lambda(t, \eta) = \frac{1}{4} [\eta(1 - e^{-2t/\eta}) + 2t]$  is the exponential rate of encountering recombination events that change the coalescence time when the local coalescence time is  $t$  (see above and CARMÍ *et al.* (2014)). Note that under the SMC, the length  $l_i$  of a segment is independent of the relative population size  $\eta$  given the local coalescence time  $t_i$ . This is not true for the SMC', since the probability that the coalescence time changes at a recombination site depends on the population size.

For a given set of observations  $\{(t_i, l_i)\}$ , the maximum-likelihood estimate  $\hat{\eta}$  of the relative population size under the SMC is

$$\hat{\eta} = \underset{\eta}{\operatorname{argmax}} L(\eta|\{(t_i, l_i)\}) = \underset{\eta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i|t_{i-1}; \eta). \quad (37)$$

As the length of the chromosome increases and the number of coalescence-time changes goes to infinity, the asymptotic maximum-likelihood estimate  $\hat{\eta}^*$  of the relative population size under the SMC is

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\eta}^* &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i | t_{i-1}; \eta) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \left\{ \log \left( \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \right) + \sum_{i=2}^k \log [q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i | t_{i-1}; \eta)] \right\} \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \sum_{i=2}^k \log(q_{\text{SMC}}(t_i | t_{i-1}; \eta)) \\
&= \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} E_{\text{ARG}} [\log(q_{\text{SMC}}(T | S; \eta))] \\
&= \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \pi_{\text{SMC}'}(s) q_{\text{SMC}'}(t | s; 1) \log(q_{\text{SMC}}(t | s; \eta)) dt ds \\
&\approx 0.95.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Here the penultimate equality holds only if there is ergodic (i.e., law-of-large-numbers-like) convergence of the sequence of pairs of coalescence times on either side of a recombination site under the ARG. In the Appendix, we show that the continuous-chromosome pairwise ARG is ergodic. That is, the mean coalescence time across a long chromosome converges to the mean coalescence time at a single point along the chromosome. We are unable to prove the ergodicity of the sequence of pairs of coalescence times at recombination sites where the coalescence time changes; instead, we note that (38) is supported by simulation (see below). We also note that WIUF (2006) proved the ergodicity of the discrete-locus ARG under a variety of neutral demographic models. A similarly in-depth proof may also apply to (38) in the context of continuous-chromosome models, but we do not explore the point further.

In (38), the ultimate equality follows from the fact that the joint distribution of coalescence times is marginally the same at recombination sites under the ARG and the SMC'. Numerical maximization of the double integral shows that the maximum-likelihood estimate of a single population size  $N$  under the pairwise SMC is asymptotically biased, with the asymptotic estimate being approximately  $0.95N$ .

Under the ARG, the stationary distribution of lengths between recombination events that change the local coalescence time (i.e., the identity-by-descent segment length distribution) is slightly different from that of the SMC'. (They are different because subsequent recombination events “heal” with slightly different probabilities under the ARG, while under the SMC', each subsequent recombination event heals with the same probability.) Under the ARG, the identity-by-descent (IBD) length distribution is not currently known. Given that under the SMC' the maximum-likelihood estimator for a relative population size involves the observed lengths, it is not currently possible to calculate the asymptotic bias of the pairwise SMC' maximum-likelihood estimator of a single population size. However, the IBD length distribution under the ARG is approximated very closely by the SMC' IBD length distribution (Carmi *et al.*, 2014), so the SMC' estimator is likely to be nearly asymptotically unbiased.

We propose the following estimator, which should be asymptotically unbiased for data generated by the ARG:

$$\hat{\eta}' = \operatorname{argmax}_{\eta} \frac{1}{\eta} e^{-\frac{t_1}{\eta}} \prod_{i=2}^k q_{\text{SMC}'}(t_i | t_{i-1}; \eta). \tag{39}$$

This estimator is unbiased under the same assumption that was used to calculate the asymptotic bias of the SMC above, which is that the sequence of pairs of coalescence times are ergodic across an infinitely long chromosome.

We confirm the asymptotic bias of the SMC estimator and the apparent lack of asymptotic bias of the SMC' estimator and  $\hat{\eta}'$  by simulation. Figure 10 shows 100 simulated estimates calculated using the SMC, SMC', and SMC'-lengths-only likelihood functions. Each estimate was calculated using 100 independent pairs of chromosomes simulated under the ARG, with each chromosome of total length  $4Nl = 1000$ , where  $N$  is the diploid size and  $l$  is the length in Morgans. To calculate these estimators for multiple chromosomes, all likelihood functions were multiplied across independent pairs of chromosomes. The same set of simulations



was used to produce the estimators for all three likelihood functions.




Figure 10: Maximum-likelihood estimates of relative population size with three different Markov chain likelihood functions. For each simulation, the segment lengths and coalescence times were taken from 100 independent pairs of chromosomes, with each chromosome being of length  $\rho = 4Nr = 1000$  simulated under the ARG. A maximum-likelihood estimate was calculated using the SMC, SMC', and times-only SMC' likelihood functions (equations (35), (36), and (39), respectively). The true scaled population size is  $\eta = 1$ , shown with the dashed blue line. The predicted asymptotic bias of the SMC likelihood function ( $\hat{\eta} = 0.95$ ) is shown with a solid blue line. The sample mean of the estimates calculated with each likelihood function is shown with a solid red line. A total of 100 simulated datasets were analyzed.

### 3. Discussion

We have proposed a model that describes the pairwise coalescence times at two fixed loci evolving under the SMC' model of coalescence with recombination. We analyzed this model to derive quantities that have not been derived previously for the SMC', including the joint density of coalescence times (unconditional and conditional), the probability that the coalescence times are the same, and the covariance of the two coalescence times, which was shown to be equal to the probability that the coalescence times are the same for the ARG, SMC, and SMC'. We compared these quantities against those produced by the ARG and SMC models. In every comparison, the difference between the ARG and the SMC' was much less than the difference between the ARG and the SMC.

We also showed that the conditional distribution of coalescence times at point  $x+dx$  given the coalescence time at  $x$  is the same under the ARG and SMC'. This implies that the SMC' is the canonical first-order approximation to the pairwise ARG. However, this correspondence is true only of the continuous-chromosome models. If instead the ARG is a model of the genealogies at a sequence of discrete loci, then the first-order canonical Markov approximation is the Markov approximation obtained by modeling a conditional ARG between every successive pair of loci. This model was studied by HOBOLTH and JENSEN (2014), who referred to the model as a "natural" Markov approximation to the ARG. CHEN *et al.* (2009) presented a method of simulating data under higher-order sequentially Markov approximations to the ARG, where the ARG of some number of preceding loci is retained in the process of generating the marginal genealogy at a given locus. They showed by simulation that higher-order approximations generate times until most recent common ancestry that are more consistent with the ARG than do lower-order approximations, but little theoretical work on these higher-order Markov approximations has been done.

We showed that the maximum-likelihood estimate of a single population size under the pairwise SMC is asymptotically biased, producing an estimate of about 95% of the true population size. Given the current widespread use of the SMC model in population-genomic inference methods (LI and DURBIN, 2011; HOBOLTH *et al.*, 2007; DUTHEIL *et al.*, 2009; RASMUSSEN *et al.*, 2014; SHEEHAN *et al.*, 2013), there is an apparent need to re-examine the consequences of using the simpler SMC model instead of the slightly more complicated SMC' model. For example, it will be important to consider whether including the possibility of varying population sizes, as for example is done in the PSMC HMM inference method (LI and DURBIN, 2011), will increase or decrease asymptotic bias. In this context, using the SMC as a basis for a likelihood function may also bias the estimates of the timing of population size changes, since the longer segments produced by the ARG will seem younger when they are modeled under the SMC.

From the arguments that led to the development of the models in Figure 9, it seems that variable population size or population substructure will not change the fact that the joint distribution of coalescence times at recombination sites is the same under the SMC' and marginally under the ARG. Changing the population size to a function  $\eta(t)$  and the recombination rate to a function  $\rho(t) = \rho_0\eta(t)$  does not change the previous arguments, so long as  $\rho(t) \rightarrow 0$  as the distance  $\rho_0$  between the two loci goes to zero. For example, regardless of population size, the waiting time until the conditioned-upon recombination event will be the same under the SMC' and ARG, and the remaining coalescence events would always be distributed identically between the SMC' and ARG. Similarly, when there are more than two haplotypes sampled, it seems that the joint distributions of genealogies on either side of a recombination event would be the same between the SMC' and the ARG marginally. These ideas need to be properly explored in future studies.

The SMC' is the model underlying two recently introduced population-genetic inference methods: the multiple SMC (MSMC) method of SCHIFFELS and DURBIN (2014) (which simplifies to a PSMC' inference procedure when the number of haplotypes is two) and a procedure based on the distribution of distances between heterozygous bases, introduced by HARRIS and NIELSEN (2013). In each case it was acknowledged that the SMC' provided more accurate results than the SMC. In light of the results we present here, we suggest that whenever a first-order sequentially Markov coalescent model is needed, the SMC' should be used whenever the calculations are possible.

#### 4. Acknowledgments

We thank Erik van Doorn and Søren Asmussen for identifying the correspondence to birth-death models with killing. We are grateful to John Wakeley and Paul Marjoram for comments on earlier versions of this article. S.C. thanks the Human Frontier Science Program for financial support.

#### 5. References

##### References

- CARMI, S., P. R. WILTON, J. WAKELEY, and I. PEER, 2014 A renewal theory approach to IBD sharing. *Theoretical Population Biology* **97**: 35–48.
- CHEN, G. K., P. MARJORAM, and J. D. WALL, 2009 Fast and flexible simulation of DNA sequence data. *Genome Research* **19**: 136–142.

- DUTHEIL, J. Y., G. GANAPATHY, A. HOBOLTH, T. MAILUND, M. K. UYENOYAMA, *et al.*, 2009 Ancestral population genomics: The coalescent hidden Markov model approach. *Genetics* **183**: 259–274.
- ERIKSSON, A., B. MAHJANI, and B. MEHLIG, 2009 Sequential Markov coalescent algorithms for population models with demographic structure. *Theoretical Population Biology* **76**: 84–91.
- FERNÁNDEZ, R., and A. GALVES, 2002 Markov approximations of chains of infinite order. *Bulletin of the Brazilian Mathematical Society* **33**: 1–12.
- GALLO, S., M. LERASLE, and D. TAKAHASHI, 2013 Markov approximation of chains of infinite order in the  $\bar{d}$ -metric. *Markov Processes and Related Fields* **19**: 51–82.
- GRIFFITHS, R., and P. MARJORAM, 1997 An ancestral recombination graph. In P. Donnelly and S. Tavar, editors, *Progress in Population Genetics and Human Evolution*, volume 87 of *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and Its Application*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 257–270.
- GRIFFITHS, R. C., 1981 Neutral two-locus multiple allele models with recombination. *Theoretical Population Biology* **19**: 169–186.
- HARRIS, K., and R. NIELSEN, 2013 Inferring demographic history from a spectrum of shared haplotype lengths. *PLoS Genetics* **9**: e1003521.
- HOBOLTH, A., O. F. CHRISTENSEN, T. MAILUND, and M. H. SCHIERUP, 2007 Genomic relationships and speciation times of human, chimpanzee, and gorilla inferred from a coalescent hidden Markov model. *PLoS Genetics* **3**: e7.
- HOBOLTH, A., and J. L. JENSEN, 2014 Markovian approximation to the finite loci coalescent with recombination along multiple sequences. *Theoretical Population Biology* .
- HUDSON, R., 1991 Gene genealogies and the coalescent process. In D. Futuyma and J. Antonovics, editors, *Oxford Surveys in Evolutionary Biology*, volume 7. 1–44.
- HUDSON, R. R., and N. L. KAPLAN, 1985 Statistical properties of the number of recombination events in the history of a sample of dna sequences. *Genetics* **111**: 147–164.
- ITÔ, K., 2006 *Essentials of stochastic processes*. American Mathematical Society.
- KAPLAN, N., and R. R. HUDSON, 1985 The use of sample genealogies for studying a selectively neutral m-loci model with recombination. *Theoretical Population Biology* **28**: 382–396.
- KARLIN, S., and H. M. TAYLOR, 1975 *A first course in stochastic processes*. Academic Press.
- KIM, J., E. MOSSEL, M. Z. RÁ CZ, and N. ROSS, 2014 Can one hear the shape of a population history? arXiv:1402.2424 .
- LI, H., and R. DURBIN, 2011 Inference of human population history from individual whole-genome sequences. *Nature* **475**: 493–496.
- MARJORAM, P., and J. D. WALL, 2006 Fast “coalescent” simulation. *BMC Genetics* **7**: 16.
- MCVEAN, G. A. T., 2002 A genealogical interpretation of linkage disequilibrium. *Genetics* **162**: 987–991.
- MCVEAN, G. A. T., and N. J. CARDIN, 2005 Approximating the coalescent with recombination. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **360**: 1387–1393.
- OHTA, T., and M. KIMURA, 1971 Linkage disequilibrium between two segregating nucleotide sites under the steady flux of mutations in a finite population. *Genetics* **68**: 571–580.
- RASMUSSEN, M. D., M. J. HUBISZ, I. GRONAU, and A. SIEPEL, 2014 Genome-wide inference of ancestral recombination graphs. *PLoS Genetics* **10**: e1004342.

- SCHIFFELS, S., and R. DURBIN, 2014 Inferring human population size and separation history from multiple genome sequences. *Nature Genetics* **46**: 919–925.
- SCHWARZ, G., 1976 Noninvariance of  $\bar{d}$ -convergence of  $k$ -step Markov approximations. *Annals of Probability* **4**: 1033–1035.
- SHEEHAN, S., K. HARRIS, and Y. S. SONG, 2013 Estimating variable effective population sizes from multiple genomes: A sequentially Markov conditional sampling distribution approach. *Genetics* **194**: 647–662.
- SIMONSEN, K. L., and G. A. CHURCHILL, 1997 A Markov chain model of coalescence with recombination. *Theoretical Population Biology* **52**: 43–59.
- VAN DOORN, E. A., and A. I. ZEIFMAN, 2005 Birth-death processes with killing. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **72**: 33–42.
- WIUF, C., 2006 Consistency of estimators of population scaled parameters using composite likelihood. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **53**: 821–841.
- WIUF, C., and J. HEIN, 1999 Recombination as a point process along sequences. *Theoretical Population Biology* **55**: 248–259.

## 6. Appendix

### 6.1. Pairwise ARG is ergodic

Here we show that the pairwise ARG is sequentially ergodic. Let  $\{t(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$  represent the random pairwise coalescence time at point  $x$  along two aligned, continuous, infinitely-long chromosomes modeled by the ARG. Let time be scaled such that the marginal distribution of  $t(x)$  is exponential with rate 1 for all  $x \geq 0$ , and thus  $E[t(x)] = 1$ . Let the distance across the chromosome be measured such that a segment of length  $l$  recombines apart back in time at rate  $l/2$ . (Equivalently, a recombination event happens in the chromosome interval  $(x, x + dx)$  in the time interval  $(t, t + dt)$  with infinitesimal probability  $dx dt$ .)

One useful property of  $t(x)$  is that it is strongly stationary. That is, the joint distribution of  $\{t(x)\}_{a \leq x \leq b}$  is the same as the joint distribution of  $\{t(x)\}_{a+h \leq x \leq b+h}$  for all  $0 \leq a < b$  and  $h > 0$ . To see that this is the case, consider the Wiuf and Hein (1999) algorithm for constructing an ARG sequentially across the chromosome: at a given point, a genealogy is drawn from the marginal distribution of genealogies, and then the algorithm proceeds across the chromosome generating recombination events and genealogies, where at each point along the chromosome, such events are drawn from the conditional distribution given all previous coalescence and recombination events. The initial point from which the marginal genealogy is drawn has no effect on the resulting joint distribution of genealogies.

The pairwise ARG is defined to be ergodic if

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} E \left[ \left( \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L t(x) dx - E[t(0)] \right)^2 \right] = 0. \quad (40)$$

For a stationary process with covariance function  $r(x)$ , to demonstrate ergodicity it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L r(x) dx = 0. \quad (41)$$

(See Itô (2006).) Condition (41) is met if  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = 0$ . This follows from the fact that for  $K < L$ ,

$$\frac{1}{L} \int_0^L r(x) dx = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^K r(x) dx + \frac{1}{L} \int_K^L r(x) dx. \quad (42)$$

The first term of the right-hand side disappears in the  $L \rightarrow \infty$  limit if  $r(x)$  is bounded, and the second term can be made smaller than any arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$  by choosing a large enough  $K$  (cf. KARLIN and TAYLOR, 1975, p. 478).

Under the ARG, the covariance between  $t(0)$  and  $t(x)$ ,  $x > 0$ , is

$$r(x) = \frac{x + 18}{x^2 + 13x + 18}. \quad (43)$$

Since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = 0$ , condition (41) is met and the pairwise ARG is thus sequentially ergodic: the mean coalescence time across a long chromosome converges to the mean coalescence time at a single point. A similar proof could be given for the discrete-locus ARG with evenly spaced loci, which has a covariance function of the same form as the continuous-chromosome ARG. In this case, the integrals would be replaced by the corresponding sums.