

A scaling law of multilevel evolution: how the balance between within- and among-collective evolution is determined

Nobuto Takeuchi^{1,4}, Namiko Mitarai^{2,4}, and Kunihiko Kaneko^{3,4}

¹School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

²The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Blegdamsvej 17, Copenhagen, 2100-DK, Denmark

³Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

⁴Research Center for Complex Systems Biology, Universal Biology Institute, University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

Abstract

Numerous living systems are hierarchically organised, whereby replicating components are grouped into reproducing collectives—e.g., organelles are grouped into cells, and cells are grouped into multicellular organisms. In such systems, evolution can operate at two levels: evolution among collectives, which tends to promote selfless cooperation among components within collectives (called altruism), and evolution within collectives, which tends to promote cheating among components within collectives. The balance between within- and among-collective evolution thus exerts profound impacts on the fitness of these systems. Here, we investigate how this balance depends on the size of a collective (denoted by N) and the mutation rate of components (m) through mathematical analyses and computer simulations of multiple population genetics models. We first confirm a previous result that increasing N or m accelerates within-collective evolution relative to among-collective evolution, thus promoting the evolution of cheating. Moreover, we show that when within- and among-collective evolution exactly balance

each other out, the following scaling relation generally holds: Nm^α is a constant, where scaling exponent α depends on multiple parameters, such as the strength of selection and whether altruism is a binary or quantitative trait. This relation indicates that although N and m have quantitatively distinct impacts on the balance between within- and among-collective evolution, their impacts become identical if m is scaled with a proper exponent. Our results thus provide a novel insight into conditions under which cheating or altruism evolves in hierarchically-organised replicating systems.

Keywords: major evolutionary transitions | multilevel selection | group selection | power law | Price equation | quantitative genetics

Introduction

A fundamental feature of living systems is hierarchical organization, in which replicating components are grouped into reproducing collectives [1]. For example, replicating molecules are grouped into protocells [2], organelles such as mitochondria are grouped into cells [3], cells are grouped into multicellular organisms [4], and multicellular organisms are grouped into eusocial colonies [5, 6].

Such hierarchical organization hinges on altruism among replicating components [7], the selfless action that increases collective-level fitness at the cost of self-replication of individual components [8]. For example, molecules in a protocell catalyze chemical reactions to facilitate the growth of the protocell at the cost of self-replication of the molecules, a cost that arises from a trade-off between serving as catalysts and serving as templates [9, 10]. Likewise, cells in a multicellular organism perform somatic functions beneficial to the whole organism, such as defence and locomotion, at the cost of cell proliferation due to different trade-offs [4, 11, 12].

Altruism, however, entails the risk of invasion by cheaters—selfish components that avoid

altruism and instead replicate themselves to the detriment of a collective. For example, parasitic templates replicate to the detriment of a protocell [13, 14], selfish organelles multiply to the detriment of a cell [3], and cancer cells proliferate to the detriment of a multicellular organism [15, 16]. Since cheaters replicate faster than altruists within a collective, they can out-compete the altruists, causing the decline of collective-level fitness—within-collective evolution, for short. However, collectives containing many altruists can reproduce faster than those containing many cheaters, so that altruists can be selected through competition among collectives—among-collective evolution. Evolution thus operates at multiple levels of the biological hierarchy in conflicting directions—conflicting multilevel evolution. Whether within- or among-collective evolution predominates exerts profound impacts on the stability and evolution of hierarchically-organised replicating systems [17–41], which abound in nature [1–6]. Therefore, how the balance between within- and among-collective evolution is determined is an important question in biology.

Previously, we have demonstrated that the balance between within- and among-collective evolution involves a simple scaling relation between parameters of population dynamics [39–41]. These parameters are the mutation rate of components (denoted by m) and the number of replicating components per collective (denoted by N)—in general, N represents the ‘size’ of a collective, such as the number of replicating molecules per protocell, organelles per cell, cells per multicellular organism, and organisms per colony. As m or N increases, within-collective evolution accelerates relative to among-collective evolution (i.e., promoting the evolution of cheating), and m and N display the following scaling relation when within- and among-collective evolution exactly balance each other out (i.e., no bias towards the evolution of cheating or altruism): Nm^α is a constant (i.e., $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$), where scaling exponent α is approximately one half [39–41]. This scaling relation indicates that although m and N have quantitatively different impacts on the balance between within- and among-collective evolution, their impacts are identical if m is scaled with exponent α (e.g., doubling N and

quartering m approximately cancel each other out, keeping the balance of multilevel evolution).

While the above scaling relation provides a novel insight into how the balance between within- and among-collective evolution is determined, the generality of this relation is unknown because the relation has originally been demonstrated in specific models of protocells through computer simulations [39–41]. To shed light on the generality of the scaling relation, here we adapt a standard model of population genetics, the Wright-Fisher model [42], to investigate the balance between within- and among-collective evolution. Combining computer simulations and mathematical analyses, we establish the following generalized scaling relation under the assumption that selection strengths are stationary in time: $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$, where α decreases to zero as selection strength s decreases to zero. To examine further the generality of the scaling relation, we analyse another simple model of multilevel evolution, which approaches the model studied by Kimura [22, 23] as $s \rightarrow 0$. Interestingly, our results show that this model displays a distinct scaling relation: $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$, where α *increases* to one as s decreases to zero. We show that this difference stems from the fact that our first model considers a quantitative trait, whereas our second model and Kimura’s consider a binary trait. Taken together, our results suggest that the existence of scaling relation $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$ is a general feature of conflicting multilevel evolution, but scaling exponent α depends on multiple factors in a non-trivial manner.

Model

Our model is an extension of the Wright-Fisher model to incorporate conflicting multilevel evolution [42]. The model consists of a population of M replicators grouped into collectives, each consisting of at most N replicators (Fig. 1 and Table 1). The number of replicators in a collective can increase or decrease, and if this number exceeds N , the collective randomly

divides into two.

Replicator j in collective i is assigned a heritable quantitative trait (denoted by k_{ij}) representing the degree of altruism it performs within collective i (e.g., k_{ij} represents the amount of chemical catalysis a replicating molecule provides in a protocell or the amount of somatic work a cell performs in a multicellular organism). Replicators are assumed to face a trade-off between performing altruism and undergoing self-replication. Thus, the fitness of individual replicators (denoted by w_{ij}) decreases with individual trait k_{ij} , whereas the collective-level fitness of replicators $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ increases with collective-level trait $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$, where $\langle x_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ is x_{ij} averaged over replicators in collective i (i.e., x_{ij} is averaged over the index marked with a tilde; see also Table 1). For simplicity, we assume that the strengths of selection within and among collectives, defined as

$$s_w = -\frac{\partial \ln w_{ij}}{\partial k_{ij}} \quad \text{and} \quad s_a = \frac{\partial \ln \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}, \quad (1)$$

respectively, depend only very weakly on k_{ij} and $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ (i.e., $\partial s_w / \partial k_{ij} \approx 0$ and $\partial s_a / \partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \approx 0$). This assumption implies that the relative fitness of replicators and collectives is translationally invariant with respect to k_{ij} and $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$, respectively—i.e., $(w_{ij} + \Delta w_{ij}) / w_{ij} \approx 1 + s_w \Delta k_{ij}$, and $(\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle) / \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \approx 1 + s_a \Delta \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$. Owing to this assumption, our model informs only about short-term evolution. For computer simulations, we used the following fitness function:

$$w_{ij} = e^{s_a \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{e^{-s_w k_{ij}}}{\langle e^{-s_w k_{i\tilde{j}}} \rangle}, \quad (2)$$

where s_w and s_a are constant so that Eq. (2) satisfies the above assumption. This particular form of fitness function, however, does not affect our main conclusion, as will be seen from the fact that the mathematical analysis presented below is independent of it.

The state of the model is updated in discrete time (Fig. 1). In each generation, M replicators are sampled with replacement from replicators of the previous generation with




Figure 1: Schematic of model. Replicators (dot) are grouped into collectives (circles). k_{ij} represents degree of altruism performed by replicators within collectives.

probabilities proportional to w_{ij} , as in the Wright-Fisher process [42].

During the above sampling, a replicator inherits group identity i and trait k_{ij} from its parental replicator with potential mutation (no migration among collectives is allowed). More precisely, the k_{ij} value of a replicator is set to $k_{ij_p} + \epsilon$, where k_{ij_p} is the trait of the parental replicator, and ϵ takes a value of zero with a probability of $1 - m$ or a value sampled from a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance σ (determining mutation step size) with a probability of m (representing a genetic or epigenetic mutation rate). The assumption that the mean of ϵ is zero is made on the following premise: evolution is mainly driven by selection or random genetic drift, and the direction of evolution is not directly determined by mutation. Although this premise often approximates reality, it can be wrong if a mutation rate is so high as to dictate the direction of evolution as in the error catastrophe [43], a situation that is ignored in this study. The assumption that σ is independent of k_{ij} is made for simplicity and implies that our model informs only about short-term evolution. Although we could reduce the number of parameters by aggregating m and σ into $m\sigma$ (which is the variance of ϵ), we keep them separate so that the mutation rate as usually defined is discernible.

After the above sampling, collectives containing more than N replicators are randomly divided into two, and those with no replicators removed (Fig. 1).

symbol	description
M	total number of replicators
N	maximum number of replicators per collective
L	total number of collectives
n_i	number of replicators in collective i
k_{ij}	degree of altruism performed by replicator j in collective i
w_{ij}	fitness of replicator j in collective i
s_w	within-collective selection strength: $-(\partial/\partial k_{ij}) \ln w_{ij}$
s_a	among-collective selection strength: $(\partial/\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle) \ln \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$
m	probability of mutation of k_{ij} per generation
ϵ	effect of mutation on k_{ij}
σ	variance of ϵ (only in continuous-trait model)
$\langle x_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$	within-collective average: $n_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}$
$\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[x_i]$	among-collective average: $M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i x_i$
$\langle\langle x_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$	global average: $M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij} (= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[\langle x_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])$
$\mathbb{E}[X]$	expected X after one iteration of Wright-Fisher process
$\text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[x_{ij}, y_{ij}]$	within-collective covariance: $n_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \langle x_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)(y_{ij} - \langle y_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)$
$\text{cov}_{\tilde{i}}[x_i, y_i]$	among-collective covariance: $M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (x_i - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[x_i])(y_i - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[y_i])$
v_w	within-collective variance of k_{ij} : $\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[\langle (k_{i\tilde{j}} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \rangle]$
v_a	among-collective variance of k_{ij} : $\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[\langle (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \rangle]$
v_t	total variance of k_{ij} : $\langle\langle (k_{i\tilde{j}} - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \rangle\rangle (= v_a + v_w)$
c_w	within-collective 3rd central moment of k_{ij} : $\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[\langle (k_{i\tilde{j}} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^3 \rangle]$
c_a	among-collective 3rd central moment of k_{ij} : $\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}}[\langle (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^3 \rangle]$

Table 1: Symbol list.

Results

Demonstration of a scaling relation by computer simulations

By simulating the above model, we measured the rate of change of $\langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$, where $\langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$ is x_{ij} averaged over all replicators, at steady states as a function of m and N , assuming $s_w = s_a$. The result indicates the existence of two distinct parameter regions, where $\langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$ either increases or decreases through evolution (Fig. 2; Methods under ‘Parameter-sweep diagram’).




Figure 2: Parameter-sweep diagrams ($s_w = s_a = s$, $M = 5 \times 10^5$, and $\sigma = 10^{-4}$). Symbols have following meaning: $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle > 3 \times 10^{-7}$ (black filled triangle up); $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle < -3 \times 10^{-7}$ (orange filled triangle down); RHS of Eq. (3) measured in simulations is positive (black open triangle up) or negative (orange open triangle down), where $|\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle| < 3 \times 10^{-7}$. Lines are estimated boundaries where $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ changes sign (see Methods under ‘Parameter-sweep diagram’).




Figure 3: Scaling exponent α of parameter-region boundaries where $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ changes sign as a function of selection strength. (a) Quantitative-trait model ($M = 5 \times 10^5$, and $\sigma = 10^{-4}$). Data points are simulation results (see Methods under ‘Parameter-sweep diagram’). Lines are prediction by Eqs. (10) and (11). $s_w = s_a$ (black circle and solid line), $s_w = 10s_a$ (blue triangle up and dashed line), $10s_w = s_a$ (orange triangle down and dash-dotted line). (b) Binary-trait model ($s_w = s_a$ and $M = 5 \times 10^5$).

(Note that although the model displays an unlimited increase or decrease of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ over time, the model is intended to inform about short-term evolution as described above; therefore, its result should be considered as providing information about an instantaneous rate of evolution in a steady state for given parameters.)

The two parameter regions mentioned above are demarcated by scaling relation $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$, where $\alpha \downarrow 0$ as $s \downarrow 0$ (Fig. 3a)—i.e., the evolution of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ becomes increasingly independent of m as s decreases. Similar scaling relations hold also when $s_w = 10s_a$, or $s_w = 0.1s_a$ (Fig. 3a). These results generalize those previously obtained with specific models of protocells [39, 40].

Mathematical analysis of the scaling relation

Next, we present a theory that can account for $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$ under the assumptions that s_a and s_w are sufficiently small. Although such a theory could in principle be built by calculating the dynamics of the frequency distribution of k_{ij} , for simplicity, we instead calculate the dynamics of the moments of this distribution. The expected change of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ per generation is expressed by Price's equation as follows [44, 45] (see Supplemental Text S1 "Derivation of Eq. (3)"):

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle] = \langle\langle w_{ij} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \{ \text{cov}_i [\langle w_{ij} \rangle, \langle k_{ij} \rangle] + \text{ave}_i [\text{cov}_{ij} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] \}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[x]$ is the expected value of x after one iteration of the Wright-Fisher process, $\text{cov}_i[x_i, y_i]$ is the covariance between x_i and y_i over collectives, $\text{cov}_{ij}[x_{ij}, y_{ij}]$ is the covariance between x_{ij} and y_{ij} over replicators in collective i , and $\text{ave}_i[x_i]$ is x_i averaged over collectives (see Table 1 for precise definitions). Note that the right-hand side of Eq. (3) is divided by $\langle\langle w_{ij} \rangle\rangle$, so that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle]$ depends on relative rather than absolute fitness (note also that relative fitness is independent of the absolute values of k_{ij} and $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$, as described in Model).

Expanding $\langle w_{ij} \rangle$ and w_{ij} in Eq. (3) as a Taylor series around $\langle k_{ij} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ and $k_{ij} = \langle k_{ij} \rangle$ [46], we obtain (see Supplemental Text S1 "Derivation of Eq. (4)")

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle] = s_a v_a - s_w v_w + O(s_w^2) + O(s_a^2), \quad (4)$$

where v_a is the variance of $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$ among collectives, and v_w is the average variance of k_{ij} among replicators within a collective (Table 1). Equation (4) implies that if s_a and s_w are sufficiently small, the boundary of the parameter regions, on which $\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle] = 0$, is given by the following equation: $s_a v_a = s_w v_w$. Since this equation is expected to imply scaling relation $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$, we need to calculate v_w and v_a to calculate α .

To calculate v_w and v_a , we first consider a neutral case where $s_a = s_w = 0$. Let the total variance be $v_t = v_a + v_w$. In each generation, M replicators are randomly sampled from replicators of the previous generation with mutation. Mutation increases v_t to the variance of $k_{ij} + \epsilon$, which is $v_t + m\sigma$ since k_{ij} and ϵ are uncorrelated (the variance of ϵ is $m\sigma$). Moreover, the sampling decreases the variance by a factor of $1 - M^{-1}$ (in general, sample variance of sample size M is smaller than population variance by a factor of $1 - M^{-1}$). Therefore, the expected total variance of the next generation is

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_t] = (1 - M^{-1})(v_t + m\sigma). \quad (5)$$

Likewise, the expected within-collective variance of the next generation can be calculated as follows. To enable this calculation, we assume that all collectives always consist of $\beta^{-1}N$ replicators, where β is a constant (as will be described later, this approximation becomes invalid for $s \gtrsim 1$; however, its validity for $s \ll 1$ is suggested by the fact that it enables us to calculate scaling exponent α correctly). Randomly sampling $\beta^{-1}N$ replicators from a collective with mutation is expected to change v_w to

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = (1 - \beta N^{-1})(v_w + m\sigma). \quad (6)$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = \mathbb{E}[v'_t] - \mathbb{E}[v'_w]$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = (1 - M^{-1})v_a + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1})(v_w + m\sigma), \quad (7)$$

where the first term on the right-hand side indicates a decrease due to random genetic drift, and the second term indicates an increase due to random walks of $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$ through within-collective neutral evolution. Note that Eqs. (6) and (7) partially incorporate the collective-level division-removal process implicitly through the assumption of a constant collective size.

Next, we incorporate the effect of selection on v_w and v_a . Allowing for the fact that replicators are sampled with probabilities proportional to fitness w_{ij} , we can use Price’s equation to express the expected values of v_w and v_a after one iteration of the Wright-Fisher process as follows (see Supplemental Text S1 “Derivation of Eq. (8)”) [47]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v'_w] &= (1 - \beta N^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v'_a] &= (1 - M^{-1}) [v_a + s_a c_a + O(s_a^2) + O(s_w^2)] \\ &\quad + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)],\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

where c_w is the average third central moments of k_{ij} within a collective, and c_a is the third central moment of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$. Besides the assumption of a constant collective size, the derivation of Eq. (8) involves the additional assumption that the variance of k_{ij} within collective i is statistically independent of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ as i varies.

Given that the dimension of c_w and c_a is equivalent to that of $v_w^{3/2}$ and $v_a^{3/2}$, we make a postulate, which we verify later by simulations, that

$$\begin{aligned}c_a &= -\gamma_a v_a^{3/2}, \\ c_w &= \gamma_w v_w^{3/2},\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where γ_a and γ_w are positive constants. An intuitive reason for postulating that $c_a < 0$ is due to the finiteness of M , as follows (Fig. 4). The distribution of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ has a finite range since M is finite. The right tail of this distribution, the one with greater $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$, is exponentially amplified by selection among collectives; however, the right tail cannot be extended because its length is finite [48, 49]. By contrast, the left tail is contracted by among-collective selection, and this contraction is unaffected by the finiteness of the tail length. Likewise, the finiteness of tail lengths does not affect the rightward shift of the mean of the distribution due to among-collective selection. Consequently, asymmetry builds up such that the right tail becomes




Figure 4: Mechanism by which trait distribution becomes skewed owing to selection and finiteness of population. Drawing depicts frequency distributions of collective-level trait $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ (orange) and effect of among-collective selection (blue arrows) (for simplicity, within-collective selection is not depicted). Distribution is initially assumed to be symmetric (left), so that its third central moment c_a is zero. Tails of distribution have finite lengths due to finiteness of total population size M (red arrows). Because of finite lengths, left and right tails react differently to selection depending on whether they are amplified or reduced (red cross; see also main text). Consequently, distribution gets skewed (right), and c_a becomes negative. It is postulated based on dimension that $c_a \propto -v_a^{3/2}$ at steady state, where v_a is variance of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$.

shorter than the left tail, hence $c_a < 0$. The same argument can be applied to c_w , but the direction of selection is opposite, hence the opposite sign: $c_w > 0$.

Combining Eqs. (8) and (9), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = (1 - \beta N^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - \gamma_w s_w v_w^{3/2} + O(s_w^2)] \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v'_a] &= (1 - M^{-1}) [v_a - \gamma_a s_a v_a^{3/2} + O(s_w^2) + O(s_a^2)] \quad (11) \\ &+ (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - \gamma_w s_w v_w^{3/2} + O(s_w^2)], \end{aligned}$$

Equations (10) and (11) enable us to calculate v_w and v_a at a steady state if s_a and s_w are sufficiently small (a steady state is defined as $\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = v_w$ and $\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = v_a$). For illustration, let us consider extreme conditions in which the expressions of v_w and v_a become simple. Specifically, if $\beta^{-1}N \gg 1$ and $s_w \ll [\gamma_w \sqrt{m\sigma} (\beta^{-1}N)^{3/2}]^{-1}$, Eq. (10) implies that

$$v_w \approx \beta^{-1} N m \sigma. \quad (12)$$

Moreover, Eq. (11) implies that

$$M^{-1}v_a + \gamma_a s_a v_a^{3/2} \approx (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) v_w, \quad (13)$$

where the term involving $s_a M^{-1}$ is ignored under the assumption that both s_a and M^{-1} are sufficiently small (and the assumptions that $\beta^{-1}N \gg 1$ and $s_w \ll [\gamma_w \sqrt{m\sigma} (\beta^{-1}N)^{3/2}]^{-1}$ are used again). Substituting Eq. (12) into Eq. (13), we obtain

$$v_a \approx \begin{cases} Mm\sigma \left(1 - \frac{\beta^{-1}N}{M}\right) & \text{if } s_a \ll (\gamma_a \sqrt{m\sigma} M^{3/2})^{-1} \\ \left[\frac{m\sigma}{\gamma_a s_a} \left(1 - \frac{\beta^{-1}N}{M}\right)\right]^{2/3} & \text{if } s_a \gg (\gamma_a \sqrt{m\sigma} M^{3/2})^{-1}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Equation (14) shows that v_a at a steady state is independent of N if $\beta^{-1}N \ll M$, a result that might be contrary to one's intuition since by the law of large number, increasing N reduces random genetic drift within collectives and thus decelerates the growth of v_a . Indeed, the increase of v_a per generation is approximately proportional to $N^{-1}v_w$ according to the second term of Eq. (11). However, since $v_w \propto Nm$ according to Eq. (12), N cancels out, so that v_a is independent of N (see Supplemental Fig. S1 for simulation results). This cancellation resembles that occurring in the rate of neutral molecular evolution, which is also independent of population size [50].

To examine the validity of Eqs. (10) and (11), we measured v_a , v_w , c_a , and c_w through simulations, assuming $s_w = s_a = s$ (Fig. 5). The results show that $v_a \propto m$ for a very small value of s (viz., 10^{-6}) in agreement with Eq. (14) (Fig. 5a). Moreover, $v_w \propto mN$ as predicted by Eq. (12) (Fig. 5b), except for cases where $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle < 0$ (this deviation will be discussed later). Finally, $c_a \approx \gamma_a v_a^{3/2}$ if $s \ll 1$ (Fig. 5c), and $c_w \approx \gamma_w v_w^{3/2}$ if $s \ll 1$ and $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle \lesssim 0$ (Supplemental Fig. S2), as postulated in Eq. (9). Taken together, these results support the validity of Eqs. (10) and (11) when s_w and s_a are sufficiently small, and m and N are close to the boundary of the parameter regions (i.e., $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle \approx 0$).




Figure 5: Testing theory by simulations ($M = 5 \times 10^5$, $\sigma = 10^{-4}$, and $s_w = s_a = s$). (a) Circles are simulation results: $s = 10^{-6}$ (pink), 10^{-5} (black), 10^{-2} (red), 1 (orange), 10^2 (blue). Lines are least squares regression: $v_a \propto m^\eta$, where $\eta = 0.98$ (pink), 0.8 (black), 0.62 (red), 0.48 (orange), 0.45 (blue). (b) Circles are simulation results: $s = 10^{-5}$ (black), 10^{-2} (red), 10^2 (blue). For $s = 10^{-2}$ or 10^2 , lighter (or darker) colours indicate $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle < 0$ (or > 0 , respectively). Line is $v_w \propto mN$, as predicted by Eq. (12). (c) Circles are simulation results: $s = 10^{-5}$ (black), 10^{-2} (red), 10^0 (orange), and 10^2 (blue). Line is $|c_a| \propto v_a^{3/2}$, as postulated in Eq. (9). (d) Dynamics of common ancestors of collectives: number of replicators per collective (black) and $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$ (orange). $s = 1$, $N = 562$, and $m = 0.01$. See also Methods under ‘Ancestor tracking.’

Using Eqs. (10) and (11), we can calculate the scaling exponent (α) of the boundary of the parameter regions for sufficiently small s_a and s_w . Since $\mathbb{E}[\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle] = 0$ on the parameter boundary, Eq. (4) implies that $v_a/v_w \approx s_w/s_a$. Thus, for extreme parameter conditions (viz., $1 \ll \beta^{-1}N \ll M$, and $s_w \ll [\gamma_w\sqrt{m\sigma}(\beta^{-1}N)^{3/2}]^{-1}$), Eqs. (12) and (14) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\approx 0 && \text{if } s_a \ll (\gamma_a\sqrt{m\sigma}M^{3/2})^{-1} \\ \alpha &\approx 1/3 && \text{if } s_a \gg (\gamma_a\sqrt{m\sigma}M^{3/2})^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

For $s_a \sim (\gamma_a\sqrt{m\sigma}M^{3/2})^{-1}$, Eqs. (12) and (13) imply that

$$rM^{-1}\beta^{-1} (N + \sqrt{r}s_a\Gamma N^{3/2}m^{1/2}) \approx 1, \tag{16}$$

where $r = s_w/s_a$ and $\Gamma = \gamma_a\sqrt{\sigma/\beta}M$, and Eq. (16) implies that α increases from zero to one third as $\sqrt{r}s_a$ increases from zero.

We also numerically obtained α by calculating the values of N and m ($m \in [10^{-4}, 10^{-1}]$) that satisfy $v_a/v_w = s_w/s_a$ at a steady state using Eqs. (10), (11), and the values of β , γ_a ,

and γ_w estimated from Fig. 5bc and Supplemental Fig. S2, respectively (viz., $\beta^{-1} = 0.45$ and $\gamma_a = 0.26$ through least squares regression of Eqs. (12) and (9) for $s = 10^{-6}$ and 10^{-2} , respectively; $\gamma_w = 0.25$ through least squares regression of Eq. (9) for $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle \lesssim 0$). The results agree with the simulation results for $s_a < 1$ when $r = 1$ and 10, and for $s_a < 10^{-3}$ when $r = 0.1$ (Fig. 3a). We do not know why the validity of analytical prediction is restricted when r is small. Overall, the above results support the validity of Eqs. (10) and (11) for sufficiently small values of s_a and s_w .

In addition, we note that the postulate in Eq. (9) is also supported by previous studies calculating the evolution of a quantitative trait (viz., fitness) subject to single-level selection [48, 49]. These studies show that fitness increases through evolution at a rate proportional to the two-third power of the mutation rate. That result is consistent with Eqs. (10) and (11) and, hence, also with Eq. (9), as follows. Since Ref. [48] assumes single-level selection and a very large population, let us also assume that $s_w = 0$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, respectively, in our model. Then, Eqs. (4) and (14) imply that logarithmic fitness, $\ln\langle\langle w_{ij} \rangle\rangle \propto \langle k_{ij} \rangle$, increases at a rate proportional to $m^{2/3}$ (Supplemental Fig. S1). Reversing the argument, we can also use the model of Ref. [48] to estimate the value of γ_a as about 0.25 (Supplemental Text S1 under ‘‘Estimation of γ_a ’’), which matches the value measured in our model (viz. 0.26). Moreover, the model of Ref. [48] can also be applied to estimate γ_w , and the value of γ_w measured in our model is about 0.25 (Supplemental Fig. S2). Taken together, these agreements corroborate the validity of Eq. (9).

Finally, to clarify why Eqs. (10) and (11) deviate from the simulation results for $s \gtrsim 1$ or $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle < 0$, we tracked the genealogy of collectives backwards in time to observe the common ancestors of all collectives (Methods under ‘Ancestor tracking’). Figure 5d displays the dynamics of $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$ and n_i (the per-collective number of replicators) in these ancestors along their single line of descent. The results indicate that the model displays a phenomenon previously described as *evolutionarily stable disequilibrium* (ESD, for short) [39]. Briefly, the

collectives constantly oscillate between growing and shrinking phases (Fig. 5d). During the growing phase, the collectives continually grow and divide, and their $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ values gradually decline through within-collective evolution, a decline that eventually puts the collectives to a shrinking phase. In the shrinking phase, the collectives steadily decrease in the number of constituent replicators; however, their $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ values abruptly jump at the end of the shrinking phase, a transition that brings the collectives back to the growing phase. This sudden increase of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ is due to random genetic drift induced by very severe within-collective population bottlenecks. Although such an increase of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ is an extremely rare event, it is always observed in the lineage of common ancestors because these ancestors are the survivors of among-collective selection, which favours high $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ values [39, 40].

ESD breaks the assumption—involved in Eqs. (10) and (11)—that all collectives always consist of $\beta^{-1}N$ replicators because ESD allows extremely small collectives to regrow and contribute significantly to v_w and v_a (note that the contributions of collectives to v_w and v_a are proportional to the number of replicators they contain, as defined in Table 1). We found that ESD occurs for $s \gtrsim 1$ (Fig. 5d) or for $\Delta\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle < 0$ (Supplemental Fig. S3). Thus, ESD might be responsible for the failure of Eqs. (10) and (11) to predict α for $s \gtrsim 1$ (Fig. 3) as well as the fact that $c_a \neq \gamma_a v_a^{2/3}$ for $s \gtrsim 1$ (Fig. 5c). In addition, ESD might also be responsible for the fact that v_w is not proportional to mN when $\Delta\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle < 0$ (Fig. 5b).

Another potential reason for the failure of Eqs. (10) and (11) for $s \geq 1$ is the fact that v_a and c_a constantly oscillate with a periodic sign change of c_a (Fig. 6). This oscillation not only invalidates the assumption that $c_a = \gamma_a v_a^{2/3}$, but also makes it questionable to consider a steady-state solution of Eq. (10) and (11). Finally, we add that this oscillation is distinct from ESD, in that it is observed in terms of v_a and c_a , which are properties of an entire population of collectives, whereas ESD is observed in terms of the properties of common ancestors of collectives.




Figure 6: Oscillation of v_a and c_a observed in simulations ($N = 5623$, $m = 0.1$, $s_a = s_w = 1$, $M = 5 \times 10^5$ and $\sigma = 10^{-4}$). (a) v_a (black, left coordinate) and c_a (red, right coordinate) as functions of generations. (b) Phase-space trajectory of same data as shown in a. Cross indicates mean values of v_a and c_a in this trajectory. Arrows indicate direction of trajectory.

Comparison to a binary-trait model

To examine further the generality of the scaling relation described above, we next consider a study by Kimura [22, 23]. Kimura has investigated a binary-trait (i.e., two-allele) model of multilevel evolution formulated based on a diffusion equation. Using this model, Kimura has revealed the following scaling relation that holds when within- and among-collective evolution exactly balance each other out:

$$N = \frac{\beta s_a}{4s_w} m^{-1} \quad (17)$$

(the notation has been converted to ours as described in Supplemental Text S1 under ‘‘Converting Kimura’s notation into ours’’) [22, 23]. Equation (17) is derived under the assumption that the steady-state frequency of the altruistic allele is identical to that in the absence of selection, thus involving a weak-selection approximation [22, 23]. Therefore, the scaling exponent in Kimura’s model ($\alpha \approx 1$) differs from that in ours ($\alpha \approx 0$) for $s_a \approx 0$ and $s_w \approx 0$.

To study how α depends on s (where $s = s_w = s_a$) if the trait is binary, we modified our model into a binary-trait model by assuming that k_{ij} switches between zero and one at mutation rate m . By simulating the modified model, we obtained a parameter-sweep

diagram, where parameter regions were defined by the sign of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle - 1/2$ at steady states (Supplemental Fig. S4; this definition of parameter regions is essentially equivalent to that used for the quantitative-trait model, in that it can be rephrased in terms of the sign of $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ at $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle = 1/2$). The results show that the parameter-region boundary constitutes scaling relation $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$, where $\alpha \uparrow 1$ as $s \downarrow 0$ (Fig. 3b)—i.e., the evolution of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ becomes increasingly dependent on m as s decreases. Therefore, the way α depends on s is compatible with Eq. (17), but is opposite to that in the quantitative-trait model, where $\alpha \downarrow 0$ as $s \downarrow 0$ (Fig. 3a).

To pinpoint why the two models yield such distinct predictions, we re-derived Eq. (17) using the method developed in the previous section (for details, see Supplemental Text S1 under “Derivation of Kimura’s result through our method”). Briefly, the most important difference from the quantitative-trait model is in the definition of mutation: ϵ depends on k_{ij} in the binary-trait model (specifically, ϵ takes a value of $1 - 2k_{ij_p}$ with a probability of m , where k_{ij_p} is the trait of a parental replicator). While this difference does not alter the condition for a parameter-region boundary implied by Eq. (3), it significantly changes the calculation of variances. Namely, Eqs. (6) and (7) need to be modified to

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] \approx (1 - \beta N^{-1})[v_w + 4m(1 - m)v_a] \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_a] \approx (1 - M^{-1})v_a + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1})v_w - 4(1 - \beta N^{-1})m(1 - m)v_a, \quad (19)$$

respectively, where we have assumed that the parameters are on a parameter-region boundary and, therefore, that $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle = 1/2$. Equations (18) and (19) ignore the effect of selection and are thus an approximation expected to be valid for sufficiently weak selection. Dividing Eq. (18) by Eq. (19) on each side and assuming a steady state (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[v'_w]/\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = v_w/v_a$), we obtain

$$\frac{v_w}{v_a} \approx \frac{4m(1 - m)(1 - \beta N^{-1})}{\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}}. \quad (20)$$

Imposing the condition for a parameter-region boundary, $v_w/v_a \approx s_a/s_w$, we obtain

$$\frac{4m(1-m)(1-\beta N^{-1})}{\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}} \approx \frac{s_a}{s_w}, \quad (21)$$

which is approximately the same as Eq. (17) if $m \ll 1$ and $M^{-1} \ll \beta N^{-1} \ll 1$ as assumed by Kimura [22, 23].

Equations (18) and (19) allow us to understand why the two models display different scaling exponents. These equations contain terms involving $\pm 4m(1-m)v_a$, which increase v_w and commensurately decrease v_a . This ‘transfer’ of variance occurs because mutation causes $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ to tend towards 1/2, for which v_w is maximized, in every collective. In other words, mutation directly causes the convergent evolution of $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$, raising the v_w/v_a ratio. Consequently, the balance between within- and among-collective evolution strongly depends on m . By contrast, the quantitative-trait model assumes that mutation does not cause any directional evolutionary change in $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$. Moreover, mutation equally increases v_w and v_a according to Eqs. (10), (11), and (12). Consequently, the balance between within- and among-collective evolution does not much depend on m if selection is weak.

Discussion

The results presented above suggest that scaling relation $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$ is a general feature of conflicting multilevel evolution. Scaling exponent α , however, depends in a non-trivial manner on the strength of selection and whether altruism is a quantitative or binary trait.

Although we have assumed that the parameters involved in the scaling relation—the mutation rate, selection strength, and the distinction between quantitative and binary traits—are independent of each other, these parameters are potentially correlated in reality. While such correlations are not well understood [51, 52], discussing them can illustrate the utility of the findings of this study. For this illustration, we first note that whether altruism is a

quantitative or binary trait can be translated into the number of loci involved in altruism: a quantitative trait involves many loci, whereas a binary trait involves one. The number of loci is likely to be positively correlated with the mutation rate of the trait, and it is possibly negatively correlated with the effect size of mutation (e.g., a single locus with large effects versus many loci with small effects). The effect size of mutation, in turn, is possibly positively correlated with the strength of selection. These correlations, which we assume here for the sake of illustration, would imply a spectrum of altruism ranging from a strongly-selected, binary trait with a low mutation rate to a weakly-selected, quantitative trait with a high mutation rate (we are ignoring the possibility that mutations have highly heterogeneous effects). Such correlations would be conducive to the evolution of altruism, an inference that is enabled by the following findings of this study: binary-trait altruism is susceptible to the invasion by cheaters for a high mutation rate, but this susceptibility decreases with selection strength (α decreases with s); by contrast, quantitative-trait altruism is relatively insensitive to mutation for weak selection (α decreases to zero as s decreases to zero).

Although the results of this study are phrased in the language of multilevel selection [17–41], they can easily be rephrased, *mutatis mutandis*, in the language of kin selection [53–64]. To do this, we define the relatedness of replicators as the regression coefficient of $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ on k_{ij} [65, 66], i.e., $R = v_a / (v_a + v_w)$, and express all the results in terms of R instead of v_w / v_a . Therefore, our results are compatible with the kin selection theory.

An important issue to address for future research is to test whether the scaling relation is observed in reality. Such tests could in principle be conducted through evolutionary experiments.

Capturing the essence of multilevel selection, the models and analyses presented above are likely to have broad utility. They are generally relevant for the evolution of altruism in replicators grouped into reproducing collectives, e.g., symbionts, organelles, or genetic elements grouped into cells [3], cells grouped into multicellular organisms [4], or other systems

that have emerged through major evolutionary transitions [1].

Methods

Parameter-sweep diagram

In Fig. 2, the value of $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ was estimated from slopes of the least squares regression of $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ against time. The estimates were unreliable if $|\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle| < 3 \times 10^{-7}$ owing to a limitation of simulations, in which case the RHS of Eq. (3) was used as a proxy for $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$.

Parameter-region boundaries across which $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ changes sign were estimated as follows. The value of N for which the RHS of Eq. (3) becomes zero was estimated for each selected value of m with linear interpolation from the values of the RHS of Eq. (3) (or $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ if $s \geq 10$) measured through simulations for two smallest values of N for which the RHS of Eq. (3) (or $\Delta\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle$ if $s_a \geq 10$) has different signs (the values of m and V for which simulations were run were selected as shown in Fig. 2). The resulting estimates of N were then used to estimate the value of α through the least squares regression of $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$.

Ancestor tracking

Ancestor tracking is a method that provides novel information about evolutionary dynamics by tracking the genealogy of individuals backwards in time. In our study, individuals whose genealogy was tracked were collectives. Since collectives undergo binary fission, their genealogy can be pictured as a binary tree, where an event of binary fission is represented by the coalescence of two branches of the tree. As the tree is traversed from the tips to the root (i.e., from the present to the past), all branches eventually coalesce to a single branch, the stem of the tree, which represents the lineage of common ancestors of all collectives present at a particular point in time. Information about common ancestors can be visualized as

time-series data along their line of descent, i.e., along the stem of the tree. In Fig. 5d, n_i and $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ of the common ancestors are plotted.

Competing interests

We have no competing financial interests.

Author Contributions

N.T. conceived the study, designed, implemented and analysed the models, and wrote the paper. K.K. discussed the design, results and implications of the study, and revised the manuscript at all stages. N.M. discussed the results of the study, revised the manuscript, and contributed to the supplementary material.

Data accessibility

Supplemental files are housed GSA's Figshare. Supplemental Texts and Figures can be found in Sup File 1. C++ source code implementing the models can be found in Sup File 2.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Omri Barak, Kohtoh Yukawa, and Eita Nakamura for discussion and acknowledge the contribution of NeSI to the results of this research. This research was supported by the University of Auckland computational biology theme fund and JSPS KAK-ENHI Grant Number 15H05746, 17H06386.

Supplemental Information captions

Text S1 Supplemental texts. It consists of the following sections:

1. Derivation of Eq. (3)
2. Derivation of Eq. (4)
3. Derivation of Eq. (8)
4. Estimation of γ_a
5. Derivation of Kimura's result through our method
6. Converting Kimura's notation into ours

Figure S1. Rate of logarithmic fitness increase as function of mutation rate measured through simulations.

Figure S2. Average third central moment of k_{ij} within collective (c_w) measured through simulations.

Figure S3. Dynamics of common ancestors of collectives.

Figure S4. Parameter-sweep diagrams of binary-trait model.

References

- [1] Maynard Smith J, Szathmáry E. The Major Transitions in Evolution. Oxford, UK: W. H. Freeman/Spektrum; 1995.
- [2] Joyce GF, Szostak JW. Protocells and RNA self-replication. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology. 2018;10(9):a034801.
- [3] Burt A, Trivers R. Genes in Conflict: The Biology of Selfish Genetic Elements. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press; 2006.

- [4] Buss LW. *The Evolution of Individuality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1987.
- [5] Davies NB, Krebs JR, West SA. Altruism and conflict in the social insects. In: *An Introduction to Behavioural Ecology*. 4th ed. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell; 2012. p. 307-33.
- [6] Gershwin L, Lewis M, Gowlett-Holmes K, Kloser R. The Siphonophores. In: Gershwin La, editor. *Pelagic Invertebrates of South-Eastern Australia: A Field Reference Guide*. Version 1.1. Hobart: CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research; 2014. .
- [7] Bourke AFG. *Principles of Social Evolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2011.
- [8] West SA, Griffin AS, Gardner A. Social semantics: altruism, cooperation, mutualism, strong reciprocity and group selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 2007;20(2):415-32.
- [9] Durand PM, Michod RE. Genomics in the light of evolutionary transitions. *Evolution*. 2010;64(6):1533-40.
- [10] Ivica NA, Obermayer B, Campbell GW, Rajamani S, Gerland U, Chen IA. The paradox of dual roles in the RNA World: Resolving the conflict between stable folding and templating ability. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*. 2013;77(3):55-63.
- [11] Bell G. The origin and early evolution of germ cells as illustrated by the Volvocales. In: Halvorson HO, Monroy A, editors. *The Origin and Evolution of Sex*. New York, NY: Alan R. Liss, Inc.; 1985. p. 221-56.
- [12] Kirk DL. *Volvox: Molecular-Genetic Origins of Multicellularity and Cellular Differentiation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge, U.K.; 1998.

- [13] Maynard Smith J. Hypercycles and the origin of life. *Nature*. 1979;280(5722):445-6.
- [14] Bansho Y, Furubayashi T, Ichihashi N, Yomo T. Host-parasite oscillation dynamics and evolution in a compartmentalized RNA replication system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2016;113(15):4045-50.
- [15] Greaves M, Maley CC. Clonal evolution in cancer. *Nature*. 2012;481(7381):306-13.
- [16] Aktipis CA, Boddy AM, Jansen G, Hibner U, Hochberg ME, Maley CC, et al. Cancer across the tree of life: cooperation and cheating in multicellularity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2015;370(1673):20140219.
- [17] Wilson DS. A theory of group selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1975;72(1):143-6.
- [18] Slatkin M, Wade MJ. Group selection on a quantitative character. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1978;75(7):3531-4.
- [19] Aoki K. A Condition for group selection to prevail over counteracting individual selection. *Evolution*. 1982;36(4):832.
- [20] Crow JF, Aoki K. Group selection for a polygenic behavioral trait: A differential proliferation model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1982;79(8):2628-31.
- [21] Leigh EG. When does the good of the group override the advantage of the individual? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1983;80(10):2985-9.
- [22] Kimura M. Evolution of an altruistic trait through group selection as studied by the diffusion equation method. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology*. 1984;1(1):1-15.

- [23] Kimura M. Diffusion model of population genetics incorporating group selection, with special reference to an altruistic trait. In: Ito K, Hida T, editors. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. Berlin: Springer; 1986. p. 101-18.
- [24] Frank SA. Kin selection and virulence in the evolution of protocells and parasites. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences*. 1994;258(1352):153-61.
- [25] Rispe C, Moran NA. Accumulation of Deleterious Mutations in Endosymbionts: Muller's Ratchet with Two Levels of Selection. *The American Naturalist*. 2000;156(4):425-41.
- [26] Goodnight CJ. Multilevel selection: The evolution of cooperation in non-kin groups. *Population Ecology*. 2005;47(1):3-12.
- [27] Traulsen A, Nowak MA. Evolution of cooperation by multilevel selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2006;103(29):10952-5.
- [28] Bijma P, Muir WM, Van Arendonk JAM. Multilevel selection 1: Quantitative genetics of inheritance and response to selection. *Genetics*. 2007;175(1):277-88.
- [29] Leigh EG. The group selection controversy. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 2010;23(1):6-19.
- [30] Chuang JS, Rivoire O, Leibler S. Simpson's paradox in a synthetic microbial system. *Science*. 2009;323(5911):272-5.
- [31] Frank SA. Natural selection. III. Selection versus transmission and the levels of selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 2012;25(2):227-43.
- [32] Simon B, Fletcher JA, Doebeli M. Towards a general theory of group selection. *Evolution*. 2013;67(6):1561-72.

- [33] Fontanari JF, Serva M. Nonlinear group survival in Kimura's model for the evolution of altruism. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 2014;249(1):18-26.
- [34] Luo S. A unifying framework reveals key properties of multilevel selection. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 2014;341:41-52.
- [35] Tarnita CE, Taubes CH, Nowak MA. Evolutionary construction by staying together and coming together. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 2013;320:10-22.
- [36] Blokhuis A, Lacoste D, Nghe P, Peliti L. Selection dynamics in transient compartmentalization. *Physical Review Letters*. 2018;120(15):158101.
- [37] van Vliet S, Doebeli M. The role of multilevel selection in host microbiome evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2019;116(41):20591-7.
- [38] Cooney DB. The replicator dynamics for multilevel selection in evolutionary games. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 2019;79(1):101-54.
- [39] Takeuchi N, Kaneko K, Hogeweg P. Evolutionarily stable disequilibrium: endless dynamics of evolution in a stationary population. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. 2016;283(1830):20153109.
- [40] Takeuchi N, Hogeweg P, Kaneko K. The origin of a primordial genome through spontaneous symmetry breaking. *Nature Communications*. 2017;8(1):250.
- [41] Takeuchi N, Kaneko K. The origin of the central dogma through conflicting multilevel selection. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2019;286(1912):20191359.
- [42] Ewens WJ. *Mathematical Population Genetics*. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2004.

- [43] Domingo E, Escarmís C, Lázaro E, Manrubia SC. Quasispecies dynamics and RNA virus extinction. *Virus Research*. 2005;107(2):129-39.
- [44] Price GR. Extension of covariance selection mathematics. *Annals of Human Genetics*. 1972;35(4):485-90.
- [45] Hamilton WD. Innate social aptitudes of man: an approach from evolutionary genetics. In: Fox R, editor. *Biosocial Anthoroplogy*. London, UK: Malaby Press; 1975. p. 133-53.
- [46] Iwasa Y, Pomiankowski A, Nee S. The evolution of costly mate preferences II. The ‘handicap’ principle. *Evolution*. 1991;45(6):1431-42.
- [47] Zhang XS, Hill WG. Change and maintenance of variation in quantitative traits in the context of the Price equation. *Theoretical Population Biology*. 2010;77(1):14-22.
- [48] Tsimring LS, Levine H, Kessler DA. RNA virus evolution via a fitness-space model. *Physical Review Letters*. 1996;76(23):4440-3.
- [49] Hallatschek O. The noisy edge of traveling waves. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2011;108(5):1783-7.
- [50] Kimura M. Evolutionary rate at the molecular level. *Nature*. 1968;217(5129):624-6.
- [51] Thompson GJ, Hurd PL, Crespi BJ. Genes underlying altruism. *Biology Letters*. 2013;9(6):20130395.
- [52] Kasper C, Vierbuchen M, Ernst U, Fischer S, Radersma R, Raulo A, et al. Genetics and developmental biology of cooperation. *Molecular Ecology*. 2017;26(17):4364-77.
- [53] Queller DC. Kinship, reciprocity and synergism in the evolution of social behaviour. *Nature*. 1985;318(6044):366-7.

- [54] Cheverud JM. A Quantitative Genetic Model of Altruistic Selection. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 1985;16(3):239-43.
- [55] Queller DC. A general model for kin selection. *Evolution*. 1992;46(2):376-80.
- [56] Wolf JB, Brodie Iii ED, Moore AJ. Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process. II. Selection resulting from social interactions. *The American Naturalist*. 1999;153(3):254-66.
- [57] Frank SA. Multivariate analysis of correlated selection and kin selection, with an ESS maximization method. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 1997;189(3):307-16.
- [58] Gardner A, West SA, Barton NH. The relation between multilocus population genetics and social evolution theory. *The American Naturalist*. 2007;169(2):207-26.
- [59] Bijma P, Wade MJ. The joint effects of kin, multilevel selection and indirect genetic effects on response to genetic selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 2008;21(5):1175-88.
- [60] Chuang JS, Rivoire O, Leibler S. Cooperation and Hamilton's rule in a simple synthetic microbial system. *Molecular Systems Biology*. 2010;6(1):398.
- [61] McGlothlin JW, Moore AJ, Wolf JB, Brodie ED. Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process. III. Social evolution. *Evolution*. 2010;64(9):2558-74.
- [62] Queller DC. Expanded social fitness and Hamilton's rule for kin, kith, and kind. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2011;108(SUPPL. 2):10792-9.
- [63] Akçay E, van Cleve J. Behavioral responses in structured populations pave the way to group optimality. *The American Naturalist*. 2012;179(2):257-69.

- [64] McGlothlin JW, Wolf JB, Brodie ED, Moore AJ. Quantitative genetic versions of Hamilton's rule with empirical applications. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2014;369(1642):20130358.
- [65] Hamilton WD. Selfish and spiteful behaviour in an evolutionary model. *Nature*. 1970;228(5277):1218-20.
- [66] Rice SH. *Evolutionary Theory: Mathematical and Conceptual Foundations*. Sunderland, MA, USA: Sinauer Associates; 2004.

Supplementary information

A scaling law of multilevel evolution: how the balance between within- and among-collective evolution is determined

Nobuto Takeuchi^{*1,4}, Namiko Mitarai^{2,4}, and Kunihiko Kaneko^{3,4}

¹School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

²The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Blegdamsvej 17, Copenhagen, 2100-DK, Denmark

³Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

⁴Research Center for Complex Systems Biology, Universal Biology Institute, University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

1 Derivation of Eq. (3)

In this section, we derive Eq. (3) of the main text, which is redisplayed below:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle] = \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \left\{ \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] + \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [\text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] \right\},$$

where the symbols are defined as follows:

$$\langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \quad (\text{S1})$$

*Corresponding author. E-mail: nobuto.takeuchi@auckland.ac.nz

where M is the total number of replicators, n_i is the number of replicators in collective i , L is the number of collectives, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle &:= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} k_{ij}, \\
\langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle &:= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \\
\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle &:= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij}, \\
\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}} [\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle] &:= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle) (\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle), \\
\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] &:= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (w_{ij} - \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle) (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle), \\
\text{ave}_{i\bar{j}} [\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] &:= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i \text{cov}_{i\bar{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}].
\end{aligned} \tag{S2}$$

In each generation, a replicator is sampled M times with replacement from replicators of the previous generation with probabilities proportional to fitness w_{ij} , as in the Wright-Fisher process (see the main text under ‘‘Model’’). To express $\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle$ in the next generation, we introduce the following symbols. Let I_l be the index of the collective to which the l th sampled replicator belongs ($l \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$), J_l be the index of the sampled replicator within collective I_l , and $P(I_l = i, J_l = j)$ be the probability that replicator j in collective i is sampled. By the definition of the Wright-Fisher process,

$$P(I_l = i, J_l = j) = \frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle}. \tag{S3}$$

Moreover, let $\epsilon_{I_l J_l}$ be the effect of mutation and $P(\epsilon_{I_l J_l})$ be its probability distribution function ($\epsilon_{I_l J_l}$ takes a value of 0 with a probability $1 - m$ or a value sampled from a Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance σ with a probability m). Finally, let $\mathbb{E}[x]$ denote the expected value of x after one iteration of the Wright-Fisher process; e.g.,

$$\mathbb{E}[k_{I_l J_l} + \epsilon_{I_l J_l}] = \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I_l = i, J_l = j) \int dP(\epsilon_{I_l J_l}) (k_{ij} + \epsilon_{I_l J_l}). \tag{S4}$$

Using these definitions, we can express the expected change of $\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle$ per generation, denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle]$, as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle] = \mathbb{E} \left[M^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^M (k_{I_l J_l} + \epsilon_{I_l J_l}) \right] - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle. \tag{S5}$$

Since I_l and J_l are independent and identically distributed for different values of l , we can remove the summation in the above equation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle] &= \mathbb{E} [k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}] - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} [k_{IJ}] - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{S6}$$

where we used the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{IJ}] = 0$ and omitted subscript l .

The first term on the RHS of Eq. (S6) can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}] &= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) k_{ij} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle} k_{ij} \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} k_{ij} \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} k_{ij} \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle + \text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}]) \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{M} \left(\sum_{i=1}^L n_i \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle \right) + \text{ave}_{i\bar{j}}[\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] \right\} \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} (\text{cov}_i[\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle] + \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle + \text{ave}_i[\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}]]) \\
&= \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle + \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \{ \text{cov}_i[\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle] + \text{ave}_i[\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S7}$$

Substituting Eq. (S7) into Eq. (S6), we obtain Eq. (3).

2 Derivation of Eq. (4)

In this section, we derive Eq. (4) of the main text, which is redisplayed below:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle] = s_a v_a - s_w v_w + O(s_w^2) + O(s_a^2),$$

where the symbols are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_a &:= \text{cov}_i[\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \\
v_{wi} &:= \text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[k_{ij}, k_{ij}] = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle)^2, \\
v_w &:= \text{ave}_{i\bar{j}}[v_{wi}] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i v_{wi}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S8}$$

Equation (4) is obtained by expanding $\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ and w_{ij} in Eq. (3), i.e.,

$$\Delta \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_i[\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle] + \langle\langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{ave}_{i\bar{j}}[\text{cov}_{i\bar{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}]],$$

as Taylor series around $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle$ and $k_{ij} = \langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$, respectively.

First, we obtain the first term of Eq. (4), which stems from the first term of Eq. (3). We assume that $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ is an analytic function of $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and that $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$ for $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$. Expanding $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ around $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$, we obtain

$$\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle + \frac{\partial \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) + \frac{\partial^2 \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^2} (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 + \dots \quad (\text{S9})$$

Dividing both sides by $\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$, we obtain

$$\frac{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} = 1 + \frac{1}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \frac{\partial \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) + \frac{1}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \frac{\partial^2 \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^2} (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 + \dots \quad (\text{S10})$$

By the definition of selection strength (see the main text under ‘‘Model’’),

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{1}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \frac{\partial \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \right|_{\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} &= \left(\frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{\partial \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \right) \Big|_{\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \\ &:= s_a \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

By mathematical induction, it can be shown that

$$\frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{\partial^{l+1} \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{l+1}} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} + \frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{\partial \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \right) \frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{\partial^l \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^l} \quad (\text{S12})$$

for $l \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Since it is assumed that $\partial s_a / \partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = 0$ (see the main text under ‘‘Model’’), the above equation implies that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} \frac{\partial^l \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\partial \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^l} \right) \Big|_{\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} = s_a^l. \quad (\text{S13})$$

Given the above equation, Eq. (S10) implies that

$$\frac{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} = 1 + s_a (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) + O(s_a^2). \quad (\text{S14})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_i [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] &= \text{cov}_i [1 + s_a (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) + O(s_a^2), \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] \\ &= s_a v_a + O(s_a^2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

Second, we obtain the second term of Eq. (4), which stems from the second term of Eq. (3). Using the same method as above, we can show that

$$\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] = -s_w v_{wi} + O(s_w^2). \quad (\text{S16})$$

We assume that $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and v_{wi} are statistically uncorrelated as i varies (this is equivalent to assuming that $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and v_{wi} are uncorrelated). Under this assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [\text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}]] &= \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [-\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle s_w v_{wi} + O(s_w^2)] \\ &= -\text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] s_w \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [v_{wi}] + O(s_w^2) \\ &= -\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle s_w v_w + O(s_w^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S17})$$

Substituting Eqs. (S15) and (S17) into Eq. (3), we obtain Eq. (4).

3 Derivation of Eq. (8)

In this section, we derive Eq. (8), which is redisplayed below:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v'_w] &= (1 - \beta N^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v'_a] &= (1 - M^{-1}) [v_a + s_a c_a + O((s_w + s_a)^2)] \\ &\quad + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) [v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)],\end{aligned}$$

3.1 Calculation of $\mathbb{E}[v'_w]$

To calculate $\mathbb{E}[v'_w]$, we introduce the following symbols. Let n'_i be the number of replicators in collective i after one iteration of the Wright-Fisher process. Note that n'_i is a random variable and can be expressed as

$$n'_i = \sum_{l=1}^M \delta_{I_l i} \quad (\text{S18})$$

where $\delta_{I_l i}$ is the Kronecker delta (i.e., $\delta_{I_l i} = 1$ if $I_l = i$, and $\delta_{I_l i} = 0$ otherwise). Moreover, let $\langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle$ and $\langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle$ be the sample mean of k_{iJ_l} and ϵ_{iJ_l} within collective i :

$$\begin{aligned}\langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle &:= \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l} \\ \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle &:= \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{iJ_l},\end{aligned} \quad (\text{S19})$$

which are defined to be zero when $n'_i = 0$. The probability that $J_l = j$ given $I_l = i$ is

$$\begin{aligned}P(J = j | I = i) &= \frac{P(I = i, J = i)}{P(I = i)} \\ &= \frac{P(I = i, J = i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I = i, J = i)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle}} \\ &= \frac{\frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle}}{\frac{n_i \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle}{M \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle}} \\ &= \frac{w_{ij}}{n_i \langle w_{i\bar{j}} \rangle},\end{aligned} \quad (\text{S20})$$

where Eq. (S3) is used.

Using the symbols defined above, we can express the sample variance of k_{ij} within collective i in the next generation as

$$v'_{wi} := \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} + \epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2, \quad (\text{S21})$$

which is defined to be zero when $n'_i = 0$. Using v'_{wi} , we can express $\mathbb{E}[v'_w]$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n'_i v'_{wi}\right]. \quad (\text{S22})$$

In the last equation, we can separate k_{iJ_l} and ϵ_{iJ_l} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v'_w] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n'_i \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} + \epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \left\{ (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 + (\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 + 2(k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)(\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle) \right\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2\right] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)(\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S23})$$

The last term of the final line of Eq. (S23) can be shown to be zero, as follows. With the Kronecker delta δ_{Ii} , this term can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)(\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^M \delta_{Ii} (k_{I_l J_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)(\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\delta_{Ii} (k_{I_l J_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)] \mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

where we used the fact that k_{iJ_l} and ϵ_{iJ_l} are independent of each other. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2\right]. \quad (\text{S25})$$

To calculate the first term of Eq. (S25), we define within-collective conditional expectation as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[x_{IJ}] := \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J = j|I = i)x_{ij}. \quad (\text{S26})$$

Using Eq. (S26), we can transform the first term of Eq. (S25) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle) \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 + n'_i (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2 (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle) \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) \right\} \right] \tag{S27} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 + n'_i (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2 (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle) n'_i (\langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 - n'_i (\langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right\} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[n'_i (\langle k_{iJ_l} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the last line of Eq. (S27) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l}^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]k_{iJ_l} + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l}^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l} + n'_i \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l}^2 \right] - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l} \right] + \mathbb{E}[n'_i] \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S28}$$

Using the Kronecker delta δ_{Ii} , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^M \delta_{I_i} k_{I_l J_l} \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^M \mathbb{E} [\delta_{I_i} k_{I_l J_l}] \\
&= M \mathbb{E} [\delta_{I_i} k_{IJ}] \\
&= M \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I = i, J = j) k_{ij} \\
&= MP(I = i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J = j | I = i) k_{ij} \\
&= M \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] \\
&= \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}].
\end{aligned} \tag{S29}$$

Likewise, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l}^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^M \delta_{I_i} k_{I_l J_l}^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^M \mathbb{E} [\delta_{I_i} k_{I_l J_l}^2] \\
&= M \mathbb{E} [\delta_{I_i} k_{IJ}^2] \\
&= M \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I = i, J = j) k_{ij}^2 \\
&= MP(I = i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J = j | I = i) k_{ij}^2 \\
&= \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}^2].
\end{aligned} \tag{S30}$$

Also, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[n'_i] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^M \delta_{Ii}\right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\delta_{Ii}] \\
&= M\mathbb{E}[\delta_{Ii}] \\
&= M \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) \\
&= MP(I=i) \\
&= \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S31}$$

Using the above results, we can transform the last line of Eq. (S28) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l}^2\right] - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l}\right] + \mathbb{E}[n'_i]\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left\{ \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S32}$$

The conditional expectation in the last line of Eq. (S32) can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J=j|i=i)k_{ij}^2 - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J=j|i=i)k_{ij} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} k_{ij}^2 - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} k_{ij} \right)^2 \\
&= \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} k_{ij}^2 - \left(\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} k_{ij} \right)^2 \\
&= \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \left(\text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}^2] + \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \langle k_{ij}^2 \rangle \right) - \left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \left(\text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \right) \right\}^2 \\
&= \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}^2] + \langle k_{ij}^2 \rangle - \left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{ij} \rangle \right\}^2 \\
&= v_{\text{wi}} + \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}^2] - \left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}] \right\}^2 - 2\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}] \langle k_{ij} \rangle \\
&= v_{\text{wi}} + \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2] - \left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}}[w_{ij}, k_{ij}] \right\}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{S33}$$

where we used the fact that $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}}^2 \rangle - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^2 = v_{wi}$. The last line of Eq. (S33) can be interpreted as the expected variance of k_{ij} within collective i after one iteration of the Wright-Fisher process excluding the effect of random sampling. Thus, let us introduce the following symbol:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s v_{wi} &:= (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) - v_{wi} \\ &= \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2] - \{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] \}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S34})$$

which denotes the expected change of the variance of k_{ij} within collective i due to within-collective selection.

Combining Eqs. (S28), (S32), (S33), and (S34), we can transform the first term in the last line of Eq. (S27) as follows

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) \quad (\text{S35})$$

Next, we calculate the second term in the last line of Eq. (S27) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[n'_i (\langle k_{iJ_i} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[n'_i \left(\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} k_{iJ_l} - \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[n'_i \left\{ \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + 2 \sum_{m \neq l} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) (k_{iJ_m} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]) \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S36})$$

where we used the fact that k_{iJ_l} and k_{iJ_m} are independent of each other for $l \neq m$ in the final step. Since n'_i can be zero, the last line of Eq. (S36) needs to be interpreted as follows:

$$\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n'_i = 0 \\ \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2, & \text{if } n'_i > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S37})$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n'_i = 0 \\ \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2, & \text{if } n'_i > 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{S38})$$

where the case for $n'_i > 0$ follows from a calculation similar to Eqs. (S28) and (S32).

To calculate the last line of Eq. (S36), we separate the case where $n'_i > 0 \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, L\}$ and the case where $n'_i = 0$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, L\}$. Let S be a proper subset of $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, L\}$, and $P(S)$ be the probability that $n'_i = 0 \forall i \in S$ and $n'_i > 0 \forall i \notin S$. The value of $P(S)$ can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(S) &\leq \left[1 - \sum_{i \in S} P(I = i) \right]^M \\
&= \left[1 - \sum_{i \in S} \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \right]^M \\
&\approx \exp \left(- \sum_{i \in S} \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{S39}$$

where the RHS of the first inequality is the probability that $n'_i = 0 \forall i \in S$ and $n'_i \geq 0 \forall i \notin S$. Using these symbols and Eq. (S34), we can express the last line of Eq. (S36) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right], \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \sum_{i \notin S} (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \sum_{i \notin S} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \left[\sum_{i=1}^L (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) - \sum_{i \in S} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{S \neq \emptyset} P(S) \sum_{i \in S} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi})
\end{aligned} \tag{S40}$$

where \sum_S is a summation over all possible $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$, and $\sum_{S \neq \emptyset}$ is the same summation excluding the case where S is empty.

We assume that the second term of the last line of Eq. (S40) is negligible for the following reasons. If $n_i \gg 1$ for some $i \in S$, then Eq. (S39) implies that $P(S) \approx 0$. Contrariwise, if the statement that $n_i \gg 1$ is false for all $i \in S$, then the value of $\sum_{i \in S} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi})$ is likely to be small because n_i is small. Under this assumption, Eq. (S40) implies that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (k_{iJ_l} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}). \tag{S41}$$

The second term of Eq. (S25) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (\epsilon_{iJ_l} - \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} (\epsilon_{iJ_l}^2 - 2\langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle \epsilon_{iJ_l} + \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle^2) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{iJ_l}^2 - 2\langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{iJ_l} + \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle^2 \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} 1 \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{iJ_l}^2 - 2n'_i \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle + n'_i \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{iJ_l}^2 - n'_i \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M \epsilon_{I_l J_l}^2 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n'_i \langle \epsilon_{iJ_l} \rangle^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M \epsilon_{I_l J_l}^2 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L n'_i \left(\frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{I_l J_l} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{1}{n'_i} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{I_l J_l} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{1}{n'_i} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{I_l J_l}^2 + 2 \sum_{l \neq m} \epsilon_{I_l J_l} \epsilon_{I_m J_m} \right) \right] \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{1}{n'_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n'_i} \epsilon_{I_l J_l}^2 \right] \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \sum_{i \notin S} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{I_l J_l}^2] \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \left(\sum_{i=1}^L m\sigma - \sum_{i \in S} m\sigma \right) \\
&= m\sigma - \frac{L}{M} m\sigma + \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) \sum_{i \in S} m\sigma \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{L}{M} + \frac{1}{M} \sum_S P(S) |S| \right) m\sigma, \\
&\approx \left(1 - \frac{L}{M} \right) m\sigma,
\end{aligned} \tag{S42}$$

where $|S|$ is the number of elements in S , and we have assumed that $\sum_S P(S) |S| \ll L$ in the last step.

Combining Eqs. (S25), (S27), (S35), (S36), (S41), and (S42), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[v'_w] &\approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \{v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^L \{v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}\} + \left(1 - \frac{L}{M}\right) m\sigma \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}] + M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) \\
&\quad - M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i n_i^{-1} \{v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}\} + M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (1 - n_i^{-1}) m\sigma. \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}] + M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (1 - n_i^{-1}) (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi} + m\sigma) \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}] + \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [(1 - n_i^{-1}) (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi} + m\sigma)] \\
&= \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [(1 - n_i^{-1}) (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi} + m\sigma)],
\end{aligned} \tag{S43}$$

where we have assumed in the last step that $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and $v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}$ are statistically uncorrelated as i varies, as we have assumed in Eq. (S17).

To enable the further calculation of Eq. (S43), we assume that

$$n_i = \beta N^{-1}. \tag{S44}$$

Under this assumption, we can transform Eq. (S43) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[v'_w] &\approx \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [(1 - n_i^{-1}) (v_{wi} + m\sigma + \Delta_s v_{wi})] \\
&\approx (1 - \beta N^{-1}) \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} \left[v_{wi} + m\sigma + \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] \}^2 \right]. \\
&= (1 - \beta N^{-1}) \left(v_w + m\sigma + \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2]] + O(s_w^2) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{S45}$$

where we used Eq. (S16) in the last step. Expanding w_{ij} as a Taylor series around $k_{ij} = \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$, we can show that

$$\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2] = -s_w c_{wi} + O(s_w^2), \tag{S46}$$

where $c_{wi} := \langle (k_{i\tilde{j}} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^3 \rangle$, and that

$$\text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, (k_{ij} - \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2]] = -s_w c_w + O(s_w^2), \tag{S47}$$

where $c_w := \text{ave}_{i\tilde{j}} [c_{wi}]$. Substituting Eq. (S47) into Eq. (S45), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] \approx (1 - \beta N^{-1}) (v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)). \tag{S48}$$

3.2 Calculation of $\mathbb{E}[v'_a]$

To calculate $\mathbb{E}[v'_a]$, we first calculate $\mathbb{E}[v'_t]$ and then use the fact that $\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = \mathbb{E}[v'_t] - \mathbb{E}[v'_w]$.

We can express $\mathbb{E}[v'_t]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v'_t] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M \left\{ k_{I_l J_l} + \epsilon_{i_{J_l}} - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M (k_{I_l J_l} + \epsilon_{i_{J_l}}) \right\}^2\right] \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right) \mathbb{E}[(k_{IJ} - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}])^2] + \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right) m\sigma,\end{aligned}\tag{S49}$$

where we used the fact that $k_{I_l J_l}$ and $\epsilon_{i_{J_l}}$ are independent of each other, as we did in Eqs. (S23), (S24), and (S25).

The first term of the last line of Eq. (S49) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[(k_{IJ} - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right)\left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) \left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right) \left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) \left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J=j|I=i) \left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\right)^2\right]\end{aligned}\tag{S50}$$

The first term of the last line of Eq. (S50) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[k_{ij}^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]k_{ij} + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) (k_{ij}^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]k_{ij} + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J=j|I=i)k_{ij}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J=j|I=i)k_{ij} + \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}^2] - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}), \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}] + M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L n_i (v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}) \\
&= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}],
\end{aligned} \tag{S51}$$

where we used Eq. (S34) and the assumption that $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and $v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}$ are statistically uncorrelated as i varies, which has already been made in Eq. (S17). Using Eq. (S16) and (S47), we can transform the last line of Eq. (S51) as follows:

$$\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [v_{wi} + \Delta_s v_{wi}] = v_w - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2). \tag{S52}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(k_{ij} - \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] = v_w - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2). \tag{S53}$$

The second term of the last line of Eq. (S50) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) (\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}] \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}] + \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I=i) \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i}[k_{IJ}]^2 - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]^2
\end{aligned} \tag{S54}$$

The first term of the last line of Eq. (S54) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J = j|I = i) k_{ij} \right]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle} k_{ij} \right]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \left[\frac{1}{\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} k_{ij} \right]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \right]^2 \tag{S55} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \right]^2 \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i}{M} \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \right]^2 \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \right\}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\left\{ \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}] + \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the following notation in the final step:

$$\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle := \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{i\tilde{j}} [w_{ij}, k_{ij}]. \tag{S56}$$

The second term of the last line of Eq. (S54) is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}]^2 &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I = i, J = j) k_{ij} \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(J = j|I = i) k_{ij} \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^L P(I = i) \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] \right)^2 \\
&= \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] \right]^2. \tag{S57}
\end{aligned}$$

Doing the same calculation as in Eq. (S55), we can transform Eq. (S57) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] \right]^2 \\
&= \left[\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{n_i \langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle}{M \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle} (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle) \right]^2 \\
&= (\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2
\end{aligned} \tag{S58}$$

Combining Eqs. (S54), (S55), and (S58), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E} [k_{IJ}])^2 \right] \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] \\
&\quad - (\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] \\
&\quad - (\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 - (\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \\
&\quad - 2 \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle] \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\
&\quad - (\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \\
&\quad + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle)^2 \right] - (\text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\
&\quad - (\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \\
&\quad + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{S59}$$

We consider each term in the last line of Eq. (S59) in terms of the order of s_a and s_w . We begin with the first term.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\
& \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 + (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle]) \right] \\
&= \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] + O(s_w^2) \\
&\quad - 2 \langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle]) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{S60}$$

where we used Eqs. (S16) and (S17) in the last step. The last term of the last line of Eq. (S60) is zero because $\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ is independent of $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$, a fact that stems from

the assumptions that $\partial s_w / \partial \langle k_{ij} \rangle = 0$ (see the main text under ‘‘Model’’) and that v_{wi} is statistically uncorrelated with $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ as i varies [see Eq. (S17)]. Thus, expanding $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ as a Taylor series around $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle = \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle$, we can transform the last line of Eq. (S60) as follows:

$$\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} \left[\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] + O(s_w^2) = s_a c_a + O(s_w^2) + O(s_a^2), \quad (\text{S61})$$

where we introduced the following symbol:

$$c_a := \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^3 \right]. \quad (\text{S62})$$

Next, we consider the second term of the last line of Eq. (S59). Equation (S15) implies that

$$(\langle\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle^{-1} \text{cov}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle, \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 = O(s_a^2). \quad (\text{S63})$$

Finally, we consider the third term of the last line of Eq. (S59) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\ &= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle + \Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\ &= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 + (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 (\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle]) \right] \\ &= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle) (\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle]) \right] \\ &= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] + \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} [\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle])^2 \right] \\ &= \text{ave}_{\tilde{i}} \left[(\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle - \langle\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] + O(s_w^2), \\ &= v_a + O(s_w^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S64})$$

where we have assumed that $\langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ and $\Delta_s \langle k_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ are statistically uncorrelated, an assumption that is essentially the same as the assumption made in Eq. (S17) that v_{wi} and $\langle w_{i\tilde{j}} \rangle$ are statistically uncorrelated.

Combining Eq. (S59), (S60), (S61), (S63), and (S64), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{J|I=i} [k_{IJ}] - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ}])^2 \right] = v_a + s_a c_a + O(s_a^2) + O(s_w^2). \quad (\text{S65})$$

Combining Eq. (S49), (S50), (S53), and (S65), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_t] = (1 - M^{-1}) (v_a + s_a c_a + v_w - s_w c_w + m\sigma + O(s_a^2) + O(s_w^2)). \quad (\text{S66})$$

Substituting Eqs. (S48) and (S66) into $\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = \mathbb{E}[v'_t] - \mathbb{E}[v'_w]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v'_a] &\approx (1 - M^{-1}) (v_a + s_a c_a + v_w - s_w c_w + m\sigma + O(s_a^2) + O(s_w^2)) \\ &\quad - (1 - \beta N^{-1}) (v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)) \\ &= (1 - M^{-1}) (v_a + s_a c_a + O(s_a^2) + O(s_w^2)) \\ &\quad + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) (v_w + m\sigma - s_w c_w + O(s_w^2)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S67})$$

4 Estimation of γ_a

Tsimring et al. [1] have investigated the time evolution of the probability density $p(r, t)$ of fitness r subject to mutation and selection. In this section, we show that the results of Tsimring et al. [1] imply $C \approx -0.25V^{3/2}$, where V and C are the variance and the third central moment of $p(r, t)$, respectively. This implication is consistent with our postulate $c_a = -\gamma_a v_a^{3/2}$ made in Eq. (9) of the main text, where γ_a was measured to be about 0.25 through simulations.

Tsimring et al. [1] have considered the following equation, which describes the time evolution of $p(r, t)$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(r, t) = \theta(p - p_c) (r - \langle r \rangle) p(r, t) + D \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} p(r, t), \quad (\text{S68})$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, and $\langle r \rangle$ is the average fitness defined as

$$\langle f(r) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(r) p(r, t) dr,$$

and D is a diffusion constant. The first term on the RHS of Eq. (S68) describes the effect of selection; the second term, that of mutation. The Heaviside step function accounts for the fact that the probability density $p(r, t)$ must exceed a small threshold density p_c to grow because the size of a population is not infinite in reality. Tsimring et al. have shown that Eq. (S68) allows a travelling-wave solution, in which the peak of the density travels toward higher values of r , while maintaining a pulse-like shape, at a steady-state speed (denoted by v)

$$v = cD^{2/3}, \quad (\text{S69})$$

where the value of c depends weakly on p_c and is around 4 in a wide range of p_c [1].

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (S68) with r or $(r - \langle r \rangle)^2$ and integrating over the whole range, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle r \rangle = V - \epsilon_1, \quad (\text{S70})$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} V = C - \epsilon_2 + 2D, \quad (\text{S71})$$

where V , C , ϵ_1 , and ϵ_2 are defined as follows:

$$V = \langle (r - \langle r \rangle)^2 \rangle, \quad (\text{S72})$$

$$C = \langle (r - \langle r \rangle)^3 \rangle, \quad (\text{S73})$$

$$\epsilon_1 = \langle \theta(p_c - p) (r - \langle r \rangle)^2 \rangle, \quad (\text{S74})$$

$$\epsilon_2 = \langle \theta(p_c - p) (r - \langle r \rangle)^3 \rangle. \quad (\text{S75})$$

In obtaining Eqs. (S70) and (S71), we have assumed that the surface terms go to zero as $r \rightarrow \pm\infty$; i.e., $\lim_{r \rightarrow \pm\infty} P(r, t) = 0$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \pm\infty} rP(r, t) = 0$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \pm\infty} r \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} = 0$, and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \pm\infty} r^2 \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} = 0$.

For a travelling-wave solution of Eq. (S68) with a constant speed v and shape, Eq. (S70) implies

$$v = V - \epsilon_1. \quad (\text{S76})$$

Table S1: **Correspondence between Kimura’s notation [2] and ours.**

Kimura’s	ours	description
c	s_a	among-collective selection coefficient
v	m	mutation rate per generation from non-altruistic to altruistic allele
v'	m	reverse mutation rate; we assumed $v = v'$
s'	s_w	within-collective selection coefficient
m	0	among-collective migration rate
$2N$	$\beta^{-1}N$	number of alleles per collective; Kimura considers diploid
∞	M	total number of alleles

From Eqs. (S69) and (S76), we get

$$D = \left(\frac{V - \epsilon_1}{c} \right)^{3/2}. \quad (\text{S77})$$

Since v and ϵ_1 are constant, Eq. (S76) implies $dV/dt = 0$. Thus, Eq. (S71) implies

$$C = -2D + \epsilon_2. \quad (\text{S78})$$

Equations (S77) and (S78) imply

$$C = -2 \left(\frac{V - \epsilon_1}{c} \right)^{3/2} + \epsilon_2 \approx -2c^{-3/2}V^{3/2},$$

where we have assumed $\epsilon_1 \ll V$ and $\epsilon_2 \ll V$ to obtain the last term. Since c is about 4 according to Tsimring et al. [1], we get

$$C \approx -0.25V^{3/2}.$$

5 Converting Kimura’s notation into ours

Kimura [2] has investigated a binary-trait model of multilevel selection and shown that within-collective selection exactly balances out among-collective selection if

$$\frac{c}{v + v' + m} - 4Ns' = 0, \quad (\text{S79})$$

where the symbols are as described in Table S1 (see also the next paragraph). Equation (S79) includes Eq. (17) of the main text as a special case. Equation (S79) appears as Eq. (27) of Ref. [2] or Eq. (4.8) of Ref. [3] as and is derived therein under the assumption that the steady-state frequency of the altruistic allele is identical to that in the absence of selection, an approximation that is expected to be valid in the limit of weak selection.

To convert Kimura’s notation into ours, we assumed that the rate of mutation from a non-altruistic to an altruistic allele is identical to the rate of mutation from the altruistic to the non-altruistic allele, so that the direction of mutation is unbiased as in our quantitative-trait model. Moreover, we assumed that the migration rate among collectives is zero since

our model does not consider migration. Finally, we took account of the fact that Kimura's model considers diploid as follows. In Kimura's model, each collective consists of N diploid individuals, i.e., $2N$ alleles. The number of alleles per collective can be considered as the average number of replicators per collective in our model (i.e., $\beta^{-1}N$) because Kimura's model assumes no dominance.

6 Derivation of Kimura's result through our method

In this section, we derive Eq. (17) of the main text, which gives parameter-region boundaries of the binary-trait model, using the method developed in the main text. The most important difference between the binary-trait and quantitative-trait models resides in the definition of ϵ_{IJ} . Thus, we consider only terms involving ϵ or $m\sigma$ as described below.

First, we show that the change in the definition of ϵ_{IJ} does not affect the condition for the parameter-region boundary given by Eq. (3). In the binary-trait model, $\epsilon_{IJ} = 0$ with probability $1 - m$ and $\epsilon_{IJ} = 1 - 2k_{IJ}$ with probability m (I and J are random variables taking the indices of a sampled replicator, as defined in Section 1). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{IJ}] &= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} P(I=i, J=j) \int dP(\epsilon_{IJ}) \epsilon_{IJ} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{M \langle\langle w_{ij} \rangle\rangle} m(1 - 2k_{ij}) \\ &= m(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle) + O(s_w^2 + s_a^2 + ms_w + ms_a).\end{aligned}\tag{S80}$$

Therefore, Eq. (4) needs to be modified as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle] = s_a v_a - s_w v_w + m(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle) + O(s_w^2 + s_a^2 + ms_w + ms_a).\tag{S81}$$

This equation, however, becomes almost identical to Eq. (4) if the parameters are on the parameter-region boundary, on which $\langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle = 1/2$. Thus, the condition for the parameter-region boundary when s_a , s_w , and m are sufficiently small is the same as in the quantitative-trait model.

Next, we consider Eq. (5) and show that the change in the definition of ϵ_{IJ} makes a significant difference, which explains the difference between the binary- and quantitative-trait models. In Eq. (5), $m\sigma$ represents the difference between v_t and the variance of $k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}$. In the quantitative-trait model, this difference is simply the variance of ϵ_{IJ} because ϵ_{IJ} and k_{IJ} are independent of each other. In the binary-trait model, however, ϵ_{IJ} and k_{IJ} are not independent, and this fact affects Eq. (5), as follows. Under the assumption that $s_a = s_w = 0$, the variance of $k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}$ in the binary-trait model is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}])^2] &= (1 - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}])^2 P(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} = 1) \\ &\quad + (0 - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}])^2 P(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} = 0),\end{aligned}\tag{S82}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}P(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} = 1) &= \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle(1 - m) + (1 - \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle)m \\ P(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} = 0) &= (1 - \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle)(1 - m) + \langle\langle k_{ij} \rangle\rangle m \\ \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}] &= P(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} = 1).\end{aligned}\tag{S83}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[(k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ} - \mathbb{E}[k_{IJ} + \epsilon_{IJ}])^2] = v_t + m(1-m)(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2, \quad (\text{S84})$$

where we used the fact that $v_t = \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle(1 - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)$. Therefore, the expected sample variance of the next generation is

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_t] = (1 - M^{-1}) [v_t + m(1-m)(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2]. \quad (\text{S85})$$

Likewise, under the assumption that all collectives always consist of $\beta^{-1}N$ replicators, the expected sample variance within a collective of the next generation is

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_{wi}] = (1 - \beta N^{-1}) [v_{wi} + m(1-m)(1 - 2\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle)^2], \quad (\text{S86})$$

where the index of collectives i needs to be kept because $\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle$ depends on i . Averaging $\mathbb{E}[v'_{wi}]$ over i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v'_w] &\approx \text{ave}_i[\mathbb{E}[v'_{wi}]] \\ &= (1 - \beta N^{-1}) \{v_w + m(1-m)[(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 + 4v_a]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S87})$$

where we used the fact that $v_a = \text{ave}_i[\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle^2] - \langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle^2$. Since $\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = \mathbb{E}[v'_t] - \mathbb{E}[v'_w]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v'_a] &= (1 - M^{-1})v_a + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) \left[v_w + m(1-m)(1 - 2\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle)^2 \right] \\ &\quad - 4(1 - \beta N^{-1})m(1-m)v_a. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S88})$$

If the systems is on a parameter-region boundary, $\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle = 1/2$. Thus, setting $\langle\langle k_{i\bar{j}} \rangle\rangle = 1/2$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_w] = (1 - \beta N^{-1}) [v_w + 4m(1-m)v_a] \quad (\text{S89})$$

$$\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = (1 - M^{-1})v_a + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1})v_w - 4(1 - \beta N^{-1})m(1-m)v_a. \quad (\text{S90})$$

To apply the condition for the parameter-region boundary $v_w/v_a \approx s_a/s_w$, we need to calculate the ratio v_w/v_a . To this end, dividing Eq. (S89) by Eq. (S90) on each side, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[v'_w]}{\mathbb{E}[v'_a]} = \frac{(1 - \beta N^{-1}) \left[\frac{v_w}{v_a} + 4m(1-m) \right]}{(1 - M^{-1}) + (\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}) \frac{v_w}{v_a} - 4(1 - \beta N^{-1})m(1-m)}. \quad (\text{S91})$$

Assuming a steady state (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[v'_w]/\mathbb{E}[v'_a] = v_w/v_a$), we obtain

$$\frac{v_w}{v_a} = \frac{4m(1-m)(1 - \beta N^{-1})}{\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}}. \quad (\text{S92})$$

Using the condition $v_w/v_a \approx s_a/s_w$, we obtain

$$\frac{4m(1-m)(1 - \beta N^{-1})}{\beta N^{-1} - M^{-1}} \approx \frac{s_a}{s_w}. \quad (\text{S93})$$

If $\beta N^{-1} \ll 1$, $m \ll 1$, and $M \rightarrow \infty$ (Kimura's model assumes that $M = \infty$), we obtain

$$\frac{s_a}{s_w} \approx 4m\beta^{-1}N, \quad (\text{S94})$$

which is the same as Eq. (17).

7 Supplementary Figures




Figure S1: Rate of logarithmic fitness increase as function of mutation rate measured through simulations with no within-collective selection ($s_w = 0$, $s_a = 10^{-3}$, $M = 5 \times 10^5$, and $\sigma = 10^{-4}$). Fitness is defined as $w_{ij} = e^{s_a \langle k_{ij} \rangle}$. Symbols have following meaning: $N = 10^2$ (black circles); $N = 10^3$ (blue triangle up); $N = 10^4$ (orange triangle down); $N = 10^5$ (green diamond). Line is $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t \propto m^{2/3}$, as predicted by Eqs. (4) and (14) in main text. This figure confirms that $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t \propto m^{2/3}$ in agreement with Ref. [1]. Note also that $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle$ is roughly independent of N if $N \ll M$, which is consistent with prediction of Eq. (14) in main text.




Figure S2: Average third central moment of k_{ij} within collective (c_w) measured through simulations ($M = 5 \times 10^5$, $\sigma = 10^{-4}$, and $s_w = s_a = 10^{-2}$). (a) Ratio between effect of selection and that of random genetic drift on Δv_w as function of $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t$: $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t > 0$ (black triangle up); $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t < 0$ (red triangle down). (b) $|c_w|$ as function of v_w . Triangles are simulation results: $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t > 3 \times 10^{-7}$ (black triangle up); $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t < 3 \times 10^{-7}$ (red triangle down). Line is $|c_w| \propto v_w^{3/2}$, as postulated in Eq. (9). Least squares fitting of $|c_w| = \gamma_w v_w^{3/2}$ to data for $\Delta \langle \langle k_{ij} \rangle \rangle / \Delta t < 3 \times 10^{-7}$ yielded $\gamma_w \approx 0.25$.




Figure S3: Dynamics of common ancestors of collectives ($m = 0.01$, $M = 5 \times 10^5$, $\sigma = 10^{-4}$, and $s_a = s_w = 0.01$). Plotted are number of replicators per collective (black; left coordinate) and $\langle k_{ij} \rangle$ (orange; right coordinate). (a) $N = 5623$. In this case, $\Delta \langle k_{ij} \rangle > 0$, and evolutionarily stable disequilibrium is not clearly observed. (b) $N = 17783$. In this case, $\Delta \langle k_{ij} \rangle < 0$, and evolutionarily stable disequilibrium is clearly observed.




Figure S4: Parameter-sweep diagrams of binary-trait model ($s_w = s_a = s$ and $M = 5 \times 10^5$). Symbols have following meaning: $\langle k_{ij} \rangle > 1/2$ (triangle up); $\langle k_{ij} \rangle < 1/2$ (triangle down). Lines are estimated parameter-region boundaries. Parameter-region boundaries were estimated as follows. Zeros of $\langle k_{ij} \rangle - 1/2$ were estimated with linear interpolation with respect to N from two simulation points around parameter-region boundary for various m values between 10^{-5} and 10^{-1} . Estimated zeros were used to obtain parameter-region boundary through least squares regression of $N \propto m^{-\alpha}$.

References

- [1] Tsimring LS, Levine H, Kessler DA. RNA virus evolution via a fitness-space model. Physical Review Letters. 1996;76(23):4440-3.

- [2] Kimura M. Diffusion model of population genetics incorporating group selection, with special reference to an altruistic trait. In: Ito K, Hida T, editors. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. Berlin: Springer; 1986. p. 101-18.
- [3] Kimura M. Evolution of an altruistic trait through group selection as studied by the diffusion equation method. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology*. 1984;1(1):1-15.