

Evolutionary rate limits on biological traits

Luis Pedro García-Pintos^{1,*}

¹*Theoretical Division (T4), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

I derive uncertainty relations that bound the rate of evolutionary processes driven by natural selection, mutations, or by genetic drift. These rate limits imply that the variability –or statistical uncertainty– in a population allows for faster evolutionary rates. In particular, the variability of a given quantitative trait and of the fitness function of a population are singled out as necessary for fast changes in the trait of interest. At the same time, lower variability makes a trait less susceptible to changes due to stochastic genetic drift. These results generalize Fisher’s fundamental theorem of natural selection to dynamics that allow for mutations and genetic drift in terms of uncertainty relations that constrain the evolutionary rates of arbitrary traits.

Fisher’s theorem of natural selection links the rate of change in the average fitness of a population with the variability in fitness for evolutionary processes driven by natural selection [1]. In this way, variability is seen to serve as a resource that enables fast evolution. However, Fisher’s result is of rather limited validity: it does not apply when species mutate or in the presence of genetic drift [2–4]. Moreover, his theorem is limited to the change in the fitness of a population. Here, I extend Fisher’s results to arbitrary biological traits and to more general evolutionary processes.

The main outcome of this paper is a set of bounds that constrain the evolution rate of any quantitative biological trait A (e.g., of a particular phenotype) in terms of simple properties of the system of interest. Specifically, knowledge of expectation values and standard deviations of A and of the fitness f of a population suffices to evaluate the bounds. In this way, slowly evolving traits can be discriminated from those that can rapidly change without the need to exactly solve the complex dynamics of the system, as pictorially illustrated in Fig. 3.

Popular summary. How fast can biological evolution occur in nature? What properties of a population enable drastic changes? To what extent are evolutionary rates affected by different driving forces such as natural selection, mutation, or random processes? I address these questions mathematically by deriving bounds on the speed of evolutionary processes. The bounds take the form of uncertainty relations that relate the rate of change of a particular biological trait with its uncertainty and with the uncertainty in the fitness of a population. In this way, slowly evolving traits can be discriminated from those that can rapidly change without the need to exactly solve the complex dynamics of the system. In broad terms, the results in this paper quantify the extent by which variability in a trait leads to faster evolution.

I. RATE LIMITS ON BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES

Consider a set of species denoted by indexes $\{j\}$ with evolving number of individuals $n_j = n_j(t)$ and a total (evolving) population $N = \sum_j n_j$. I prove in the Appendix that the rate of change in the expectation value $\langle A \rangle = \sum_j a_j n_j / N$ of a quantitative trait A satisfies the equation of motion

$$\frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} = \sum_j \dot{a}_j \frac{n_j}{N} + \sum_j a_j \frac{d n_j}{dt} \frac{1}{N} = \langle \dot{A} \rangle + \text{cov}(A, r), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{cov}(A, B) := \langle AB \rangle - \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle$ denotes the covariance between two quantities and r characterizes the *growth rate* of the population, with components $r_j := \dot{n}_j / n_j$ [5]. Throughout this work, I use da/dt or \dot{a} interchangeably to denote time derivatives.

In the context of evolutionary biology, Eq. (1) is known as the (time-continuous) Price equation [6, 7]. This is a mathematical identity that holds regardless of the underlying dynamics of the system. Similar equations describe the dynamics of classical systems with evolving probability distributions [8] and of open quantum systems [9].

The second term in the Price equation, $\sum_j a_j \frac{d}{dt} (n_j / N) = \text{cov}(A, r)$, corresponds to the change in the mean $\langle A \rangle$ of a trait due to the changes in population. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this term is constrained by the uncertainty relation

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle \right| = |\text{cov}(A, r)| \leq \Delta A \Delta r, \quad (2)$$

where $(\Delta A)^2 := \langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2$ and $(\Delta r)^2 := \langle r^2 \rangle - \langle r \rangle^2$ are the variances of the trait A and of the growth rate r , respectively.

The inequality in Eq. (2) implies a fundamental trade-off between the rate of change of a biological trait A and (i) the variability ΔA in the trait and (ii) the variability Δr in the growth rate r with which the populations $\{n_j\}$ change: fast evolution requires an uncertain trait and uncertain population growth rate [10]. In contrast, there can be no instantaneous change in any observable trait for populations with an uniform growth rate $r_j = c$ for all j , since then $\Delta r = 0$. Note that, from Eq. (1), one

* lpgp@lanl.gov

concludes that the sign of $d\langle A \rangle - \langle \dot{A} \rangle$ depends on whether the trait A is positively or negatively correlated with the growth rate r .

Uncertainty relations like Eq. (2), typically referred to as speed limits in physics, also constrain the dynamics of quantum [9, 11, 12] and of classical physical [8] systems. In the latter setting, the variance in r is replaced by the Fisher information, which for a time-dependent probability distribution p_j is given by $\mathcal{I}_F := \sum_j p_j \left(\frac{\dot{p}_j}{p_j}\right)^2$ [13]. Defining $p_j := n_j/N$ as the frequency of occurrence of species j , I prove in the Appendix that indeed $\Delta r = \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_F}$.

While the constraint in Eq. (2) is extremely general, its practical usefulness may be hindered by the difficulty in relating the variability Δr (or, equivalently, the Fisher information) to the relevant parameters that govern the dynamics of a concrete system. My goal is to derive bounds on the rate of change of biological quantities —or *rate limits* for short— tailored to evolutionary processes.

II. LIMITS TO REPLICATOR EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES

Under the assumption that mutation rates between species are negligible, the *replicator equation*,

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j(f_j - \langle f \rangle), \quad (3)$$

can be used to model population dynamics [14–17] (see Refs. [18–21] for applications of the replicator equation to various other fields). Here, $p_j := n_j/N$ is the frequency of occurrence of species j , and the *fitness* $f_j = f_j(p, t)$ characterizes whether the frequency p_j of a species increases or decreases: the populations of species with positive excess fitness, $f_j \geq \langle f \rangle$, tend to grow relative to their peers [22].

Using Eq. (3), it holds that $r_j = \dot{p}_j/p_j + \dot{N}/N = f_j - \langle f \rangle + \dot{N}/N$, which in turn leads to $\Delta r = \Delta f$. Thus, Eq. (2) implies that any evolutionary process that can be modeled by the replicator equation is constrained by the uncertainty relation [23]

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle \right| = |\text{cov}(A, r)| = |\text{cov}(A, f)| \leq \Delta A \Delta f. \quad (4)$$

The rate of change in natural selection processes is limited by the variability of the fitness of the population and the variability of the quantity of interest.

The rate limit in Eq. (4) for the replicator equation implies constraints on the dynamics of arbitrary quantitative traits A . If the quantity of interest has no explicit time dependence, i.e., if $\{a_j\}$ are constant, then Eq. (4) becomes a bound on evolutionary rates $d\langle A \rangle/dt$, discriminating slowly evolving traits from those that can change rapidly. In plain terms, the bound says that evolution is slow for systems with well-determined fitness functions, where $\Delta f \approx 0$ (neutral selection regime). In contrast,




FIG. 1. **Evolutionary rate limits on quantifiable traits.**

In this work I derive bounds on the evolutionary rates of quantifiable traits on populations that evolve under natural selection, mutations, and random genetic drift. Under natural selection, a trait A with high variability ΔA can evolve faster than a trait B with small variability ΔB . At the same time, the trait with higher variability is more susceptible to the effect of random fluctuations in populations due to genetic drift. In this way, the rate limits can be used to discriminate quantifiable traits in terms of their maximum evolutionary rates and their responsiveness to different evolutionary forces.

evolution can be faster on systems with a diverse population such that Δf is large (natural selection regime). This mathematically formalizes the common understanding that diversity, as quantified by the variability in fitness, serves as an evolutionary resource [24–26], in this case by enabling fast evolution.

It is natural to wonder whether bound (4) can be saturated. This happens whenever A has a linear relationship with the growth rate r , i.e., $A_j \propto r_j + c$ where c is independent of j , in which case $\text{cov}(A, r) = \Delta A \Delta r$ [8]. Since this is the case for the fitness function under replicator dynamics, Eq. (1) yields

$$\frac{d\langle f \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{f} \rangle = \sum_j \dot{p}_j f_j = \text{cov}(f, f) = (\Delta f)^2. \quad (5)$$

This provides a simple proof of Fisher’s *fundamental the-*

orem of natural selection [1–4], and shows that Fisher’s claim is exact for (i) evolutionary processes modeled by a replicator equation with (ii) fitness functions that are independent of time, in which case $\frac{d\langle f \rangle}{dt} = (\Delta f)^2$. In situations with more general fitness functions $f_j = f_j(p, t)$, Eq. (5) provides a generalized version of Fisher’s theorem whereby the velocity with which fitness changes due to changes in population frequencies equals the fitness variance.

III. LIMITS TO EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES WITH MUTATIONS

Mutations are a crucial driving force in realistic evolutionary processes [27–29]. Mutations between species can be described by the replicator-mutator, or quasispecies, model

$$\dot{p}_j = \sum_k p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle), \quad (6)$$

where $Q_{kj} \geq 0$ is a dimensionless transition matrix, with $\sum_j Q_{kj} = 1$ [30–33]. The replicator equation (3) is recovered when the mutation matrix is the identity, $Q_{kj} = \delta_{kj}$.

The general bound (2) holds in this case, too. Note, though, that while for the replicator dynamics the variance in the growth rate equals the variance in fitness, $(\Delta r)^2 = (\Delta f)^2$, this is no longer the case for dynamics with mutations. Connecting the variance in the growth rate (or equivalently, the Fisher information) to biologically relevant quantities in concrete settings remains an interesting problem to be explored.

Alternatively, I define the mutation-driven probability distribution

$$\Pi_j := \sum_k p_k Q_{kj}. \quad (7)$$

I interpret Π as the frequency with which a given species would hypothetically occur in the future if evolution were only driven by mutations, or, possibly more biologically relevant, in regimes where strong mutation dominate over natural selection processes [27]. Note that $\Pi = p$ in the mutation-less regime.

Then, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality I prove in the Appendix one of the main results of this work,

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle - \langle f \rangle (\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle) \right| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \quad (8)$$

where $\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} := \sum_j \Pi_j a_j$ and $\Delta_{\Pi} A := \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}^2}$ are the mean and standard deviation with respect to the mutation-driven distribution Π . I emphasize that the general constraint (2) does not imply the rate limit (8). The replicator-mutator evolutionary model, given by Eq. (6), was crucial to derive the latter bound.

The rate of change of any trait A is thus constrained by the quantity’s uncertainty with respect to the mutation-driven distribution Π , and the uncertainty in the fitness

of the system. As in the mutation-less setting, diversity in the population is seen to give rise to less constrained evolution rates.

One could be puzzled by the appearance of a term in Eq. (8) that directly depends on the average fitness $\langle f \rangle$ of the population and not just on relative fitness values. After all, shifting the fitness by an additive constant $f_j \rightarrow f_j + c$ in the replicator equation (3) does not affect population dynamics. However, note that this is not the case in the mutator-replicator equation (6), where an additive constant c on the fitness function leads to a change in \dot{p}_j of $c(\Pi_j - p_j)$, which depends on how the distribution p and mutation-driven distribution Π differ. The absolute values of the fitness function play a dynamical role in a system with mutations, and this is manifested in the rate limit (8).

To further simplify interpreting the result, let us momentarily consider the case when A does not explicitly depend on time, i.e., $\{a_j\}$ constant. Then, Eq. (8) and the triangle and reverse triangle inequalities imply upper and lower rate limits,

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} \right| \geq \langle f \rangle \left| \langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle \right| - \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f \quad (9a)$$

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} \right| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f + \langle f \rangle \left| \langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle \right|. \quad (9b)$$

Here, I identify two distinct sources to the evolutionary rates achievable by the system. One of the sources, $\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f$, involves uncertainties in the fitness function and uncertainties in the trait of interest evaluated in the mutation-driven distribution. The remaining one depends on the means of the fitness and of the quantity of interest. This is somewhat reminiscent of the speed limits for open quantum systems, where two distinct sources to the dynamics of a system lead to additive contributions to the ultimate speed with which a quantity can evolve, which in turns allows to derive lower bounds on speed [9].

One of the most salient features of this work is the possibility to discriminate biological traits that evolve slowly from those that can evolve rapidly in terms of simple properties. In this case, given knowledge of expectation values $\{\langle f \rangle, \langle A \rangle, \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}\}$ and standard deviations $\{\Delta f, \Delta A, \Delta_{\Pi} A\}$, Eqs. (9a) and (9b) constrain the evolutionary rates of an observable trait A . In general, traits that are robust to mutations, $\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} \approx \langle A \rangle$, have constrained evolution rates, only bounded by variabilities in trait and fitness. At the same time, a uniform fitness landscape, often identified as the weak or neutral selection regime [34], leads to constrained dynamics where mutations dominate. (See a simple model illustrating this and testing the bounds in the Appendix.)

Another noteworthy feature of the rate limits is that they apply to arbitrary quantities. The Shannon entropy $S := -\sum_j p_j \ln p_j$, also known as the Shannon-Wiener index in ecology [35], can serve as a measure of the variability of a population. While $S \approx 0$ if only one species k occurs with $p_k \approx 1$, one has $S = \ln N$ if N species

are equally likely to occur. Taking $\{a_j \equiv I_j := -\ln p_j\}$ and using that $\dot{S} = -\sum_j \dot{p}_j \ln p_j$ from conservation of probability, Eq. (8) directly implies that

$$\left| \frac{dS}{dt} - \langle f \rangle S(p||\Pi) \right| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} I \Delta f, \quad (10)$$

where the relative entropy, or Kullback–Leibler divergence, $S(p||\Pi) := -\sum_j p_j \ln \left(\frac{p_j}{\Pi_j} \right)$ serves as a proxy of distance between the distribution p and the mutation-driven distribution Π [16, 36–38]. Note that $\Delta_{\Pi} I \geq 0$, but it is unbounded from above. In cases with an homogeneous population, $\Delta f = 0$, and finite $\Delta_{\Pi} I$, mutations drives variability since the entropy only evolves due to the mismatch between the two distributions, with a rate $\frac{dS}{dt} = \langle f \rangle S(p||\Pi)$ [39].

Next, I consider the rate of change of the average fitness function for dynamics that incorporate mutations. Equation (8) becomes

$$\left| \frac{d\langle f \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{f} \rangle - \langle f \rangle (\langle f \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle f \rangle) \right| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} f \Delta f, \quad (11)$$

which coincides with Eq. (5) in the mutation-less regime or for neutral mutations that do not influence the fitness landscape, since then $\langle f \rangle_{\Pi} = \langle f \rangle$ and $\Delta_{\Pi} f = \Delta f$.

The uncertainty relation (11) imposes the most stringent constraints on evolution when the fitness is completely certain with respect to the distribution p or to the mutation-driven distribution Π , i.e., when $\Delta_{\Pi} f = 0$ or $\Delta f = 0$. This is the neutral selection strong mutation regime (center column of Fig 2), when species have comparable fitness so that natural selection does not considerably drive evolution. In these cases, dynamics is due to the difference in fitness between the two distributions, and $d\langle f \rangle/dt - \langle \dot{f} \rangle = \langle f \rangle (\langle f \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle f \rangle)$, that is, mutations dominate. This also illustrates how beneficial and deleterious mutations can be naturally characterized by $\langle f \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle f \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle f \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle f \rangle \leq 0$, respectively, depending on the change in the average fitness of the population. Note that the contribution to the fitness rate depends on the average fitness of the population.

In contrast to the neutral selection regime, faster evolutionary rates are possible for systems with uncertain fitness landscapes. In this way, rate limits can be used to mathematically formalize evolutionary regimes according to the dynamical forces in action. I will explore this further at the end of the next section.

IV. LIMITS TO STOCHASTIC EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES

Equations (8) and (11) provide generalizations of Fisher’s fundamental theorem of natural selection to replicator-mutator dynamics in terms of universal constraints on evolutionary rates. However, the replicator

and replicator-mutator equations are only simplified deterministic models for the dynamics of infinite populations. In realistic scenarios, stochastic forces typically known as *genetic drift* play a preponderant role in evolutionary processes [40, 41].

Here, I consider a stochastic replicator-mutator equation

$$dp_j = \sum_k p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) dt + p_j \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right), \quad (12)$$

as a simple toy model to account for stochastic evolutionary processes. The first term coincides with the replicator-mutator Eq. (6) and describes natural selection and mutation dynamics, while the second term models genetic drift driven by noise terms dW_j .

In the stochastic difference equation (12), the population changes by dp_j during a time-step dt , over which a stochastic Wiener noise dW_j randomly affects the system. The strength of the genetic drift of population j is characterized by the ‘volatility parameter’ σ_j [42], while the term $\sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l$ ensures that the frequencies p_j remain normalized. Following the rules of Itô calculus, the zero-mean Wiener noises dW_j satisfy $dW_j^2 = dt$ and $\overline{dW_j dW_k} = \delta_{jk} dt$, where \overline{F} represents the average of a function $F(p)$ over realizations of the stochastic noise [43].

Dynamics is thus driven by natural selection, mutations, and random genetic drift. Note that the latter dominate dynamics for infinitesimally short times [43]. Therefore, in this case it is more meaningful to focus on integrated changes $\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau} (d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle)$ during a time interval τ rather than on rates of change. The prefactor $\frac{1}{\tau}$, which makes the quantity a time-average, ensures the same units as in Eqs. (4) and (8).

Then, I prove in the Appendix that,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau} \left(d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt \right) \right|^2 \leq \frac{\|\sigma\|_{\infty}^2}{\tau} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau} \overline{(\Delta A)^2} dt, \quad (13)$$

where $\|\sigma\|_{\infty} := \max_j \{\sigma_j\}$. Equation (13) shows that the noise-averaged change in $\langle A \rangle$ with respect to the change $[\int_0^{\tau} \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt]$, which is due to natural selection and mutations, is bounded by the variability ΔA and by the maximum strength $\|\sigma\|_{\infty}$ of the stochastic forces [44]. In plain terms, Eq. (13) provides a criteria to discriminate situations in which biological quantities are robust against genetic drift. A trait’s variability can make its dynamics more susceptible to changes due to stochastic forces. In contrast, traits with small variability $\Delta A \approx 0$ over a period τ evolve as if natural selection and mutations were the only driving evolutionary forces.

The final result of this paper singles out the contributions of natural selection, mutations, and genetic drift to




FIG. 2. **Discriminating evolutionary regimes.** The rate limits derived in this work constrain the evolution of quantifiable traits of populations driven by natural selection, mutations, or genetic drift. The bounds depend on expectation values $\{\langle f \rangle, \langle A \rangle, \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}\}$ and uncertainties $\{\Delta f, \Delta A, \Delta_{\Pi} A\}$ of the trait of interest and of the fitness profile of the population, and on the maximum strength $\|\sigma\|_{\infty}$ of genetic drift stochastic forces. Here, $\langle A \rangle_{\Pi}$ and $\Delta_{\Pi} A$ are evaluated in the distribution Π_j defined in Eq. (7), which characterizes species frequencies if the system only evolved due to mutations. Equation (14) can be used to formally define three distinct evolutionary regimes. **[Left – Strong Selection Regime]** When $\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f \gg \{\langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle|, \|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A\}$, the contributions of mutations or genetic drift to the changes in a trait are negligible. This can be identified as the regime where natural selection is the dominant evolutionary force. In it, the maximum rate of a trait is constrained by its uncertainty evaluated in the mutation-driven distribution Π : smaller trait variability implies smaller maximum rates. **[Center – Strong Mutation Regime]** Natural selection and genetic drift contributions are negligible when $\langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle| \gg \{\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A\}$. Then, the rate of change of a trait is determined by the change induced by the mutation-driven distribution, and Eq. (8) implies that $d\langle A \rangle/dt - \langle \dot{A} \rangle \approx \langle f \rangle (\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle)$. **[Right – Genetic Drift Regime]** The variability of a trait determines its susceptibility to changes due to genetic drift. In the regime $\|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A \gg \{\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle|\}$ where the stochastic force dominates, the total change in a trait over a time τ is bounded by the integrated variance of the trait and the maximum drift strength.

a bound on the noise-averaged change of a trait over a period τ ,

$$\left| \int_0^{\tau} (d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle) \right| \leq \int_0^{\tau} \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f dt \quad (14)$$

$$+ \int_0^{\tau} \langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle| dt$$

$$+ \sqrt{\|\sigma\|_{\infty}^2 \int_0^{\tau} (\Delta A)^2 dt}.$$

There are many ways in which evolutionary regimes can be (often phenomenologically) classified depending on their predominant driving forces on a given model [34, 45–48]. Equation (14) yields a formal way to mathematically demarcate such regimes by comparing the relative strengths between the sources that dominate the maximum evolutionary rate:

- *strong selection regime*
 $\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f \gg \{\langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle|, \|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A\},$
- *strong mutation regime*
 $\langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle| \gg \{\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A\},$
- *genetic drift regime*
 $\|\sigma\|_{\infty} \Delta A \gg \{\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle|\}.$

In each of the three regimes, dynamics of a trait is provably only due to the corresponding biological drive. Note that this is a trait-dependent criteria — as conveyed by Fig. 2, certain traits are more responsive than others to a given evolutionary force.

V. DISCUSSION

Recent works, mostly within the fields of quantum physics [9, 12, 49, 50] and classical statistical mechanics [51–56], but also biology [57, 58], derived uncertainty relations that constrain the dynamics of observables. I find it remarkable that constraints that bound speed, while being extremely general, are saturated in certain paradigmatic cases. In stochastic thermodynamics, for example, the rate at which heat is exchanged with a system and the rate at which a system’s entropy changes saturates their speed limits for Gibbs states with (arbitrarily) time-dependent temperature [8]. In a completely unrelated setting, particular quantum algorithms have been shown to compute as fast as allowed by speed limits tailored to quantum annealing [59].

Here, replicator dynamics—a toy model often used to describe mutation-less population dynamics in evolutionary biology—have been found to saturate the rate limit for the fitness of a population. Higher variability in fitness leads to higher evolutionary rates. This last result was, in fact, known by Fisher, who connected the rate of change of the mean fitness to the variability in the fitness of a population.

More generally, I have shown that the connection between the statistical uncertainty in fitness and evolutionary rates holds for dynamics that incorporate mutations. This allows identifying regimes in which Fisher’s relation holds even for dynamics with mutations. In all other regimes, our results generalize Fisher’s by imposing constraints on evolutionary rates.

Generalizations of Fisher’s theorem to dynamics with

mutations were considered in Refs. [60, 61]. The main difference between the present work and previous ones is that (i) Eq. (8) generalizes the constraints on evolutionary rates to arbitrary quantifiable traits and not just the fitness function, that (ii) the bound in Eq. (11) concisely shows how fitness variability influences dynamics, in the spirit of Fisher’s theorem, and that (iii) Eq. (13) accounts for stochastic evolutionary forces. Uncertainty relations that incorporate stochastic dynamics are mostly unexplored in the field of speed limits.

Naturally, there is an extensive literature devoted to understanding the factors that limit evolutionary rates [25, 26, 62–66]. However, most of such work is restricted to observations on particular species, based on experimental observations, or phenomenological in nature. In contrast, the results in this paper take the role of mathematical theorems that hold for any biological system whose dynamics can be described by the models considered [Eqs. (3), (6), or (12)] to a good approximation. The techniques presented here open a path to derive rate limits for modifications of these dynamical models.

It is worth emphasizing that the main results in this work, which constrain rates for dynamics with mutations [Eqs. (8–11)] and which discriminate quantities that are robust against stochastic driving forces [Eqs. (13, 14)], are not implied by the general speed limits derived in Ref. [8] nor by recent works generalizing the fundamental theorem of natural selection [60, 61]. Making use of the structure of the differential equations that model biological evolutionary processes was crucial in deriving the new rate limits. In particular, speed limits on stochastic noisy dynamics such as Eq. (12) are mostly unexplored.

It will be interesting to study applications of the methods used here to other models of evolutionary processes that account for genetic drift and finite size effects [41, 67–69] and other stochastic drives [70, 71]. At the same time, while I have argued and illustrated in Fig. 2 how the rate limits are useful in discriminating observable traits in terms of their evolutionary rates, it would be insightful to test these ideas in biological systems from experimental data.

The overarching aim of this work was to mathematically formalize the common knowledge that biological diversity influences evolutionary processes. The results shown here quantify ways in which variability, as quantified by the uncertainties in fitness and in the biological traits of interest, serves as a resource by allowing for faster evolution. It is tempting to ponder about the implications to related fields [72, 73].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Jake Bringewatt, Adolfo del Campo, Lucas Fernandes, Daniel Freire, Jason Green, Schuyler Nicholson, and Nicolás Rubido for discussions related to this work. This work was supported by the Beyond Moore’s Law project of the Advanced Simulation and Computing Program at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) managed by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract 89233218CNA000001. The work was carried out under the auspices of the US DOE and NNSA under contract No. DEAC52-06NA25396.

-
- [1] R. A. Fisher, *The genetical theory of natural selection* (The Clarendon Press, 1930).
- [2] G. R. Price, Fisher’s ‘fundamental theorem’ made clear, *Annals of human genetics* **36**, 129 (1972).
- [3] A. Edwards, The fundamental theorem of natural selection, *Theoretical population biology* **61**, 335 (2002).
- [4] J. C. Baez, The fundamental theorem of natural selection, *Entropy* **23**, 1436 (2021).
- [5] R. M. Sibly and J. Hone, Population growth rate and its determinants: an overview, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **357**, 1153 (2002).
- [6] S. A. Frank and F. J. Bruggeman, The fundamental equations of change in statistical ensembles and biological populations, *Entropy* **22**, 1395 (2020).
- [7] G. R. Price, Selection and covariance, *Nature* **227**, 520 (1970).
- [8] S. B. Nicholson, L. P. Garcia-Pintos, A. del Campo, and J. R. Green, Time–information uncertainty relations in thermodynamics, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1211 (2020).
- [9] L. P. García-Pintos, S. B. Nicholson, J. R. Green, A. del Campo, and A. V. Gorshkov, Unifying quantum and classical speed limits on observables, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 011038 (2022).
- [10] I equate the variability of a trait A with its standard deviation $\Delta A = \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2}$, which is in turn a measure of the statistical uncertainty of the trait in a population.
- [11] L. Mandelstam and I. Tamm, The uncertainty relation between energy and time in non-relativistic quantum mechanics, in *Selected papers* (Springer, 1991) pp. 115–123.
- [12] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, Quantum speed limits: from Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle to optimal quantum control, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 453001 (2017).
- [13] H. Cramér, *Mathematical methods of statistics*, Vol. 43 (Princeton university press, 1999).
- [14] J. Maynard Smith, The theory of games and the evolution of animal conflicts, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **47**, 209 (1974).
- [15] P. Schuster and K. Sigmund, Replicator dynamics, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **100**, 533 (1983).
- [16] J. W. Weibull, *Evolutionary game theory* (MIT press, 1997).
- [17] H. Ohtsuki and M. A. Nowak, The replicator equation on graphs, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **243**, 86 (2006).

- [18] Y. Sato and J. P. Crutchfield, Coupled replicator equations for the dynamics of learning in multiagent systems, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 015206 (2003).
- [19] K. Safarzyńska and J. C. J. M. van den Bergh, Evolutionary models in economics: a survey of methods and building blocks, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **20**, 329 (2010).
- [20] R. Cressman and Y. Tao, The replicator equation and other game dynamics, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**, 10810 (2014).
- [21] D. Bloembergen, K. Tuyls, D. Hennes, and M. Kaisers, Evolutionary dynamics of multi-agent learning: A survey, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **53**, 659 (2015).
- [22] J. M. Smith, *Evolutionary genetics* (Oxford University Press, 1998).
- [23] In the second equality I use that $r_j = f_j - \langle f \rangle + \dot{N}/N$ and that $\text{cov}(A, B + C) = \text{cov}(A, B)$ for any uniform C for which its components $c_j = c$ do not depend on j .
- [24] S. Naem, J. E. Duffy, and E. Zavaleta, The functions of biological diversity in an age of extinction, *Science* **336**, 1401 (2012).
- [25] M. W. Blows and A. A. Hoffmann, A reassessment of genetic limits to evolutionary change, *Ecology* **86**, 1371 (2005).
- [26] A. Hoffmann, M. Donoghue, S. Levin, T. Mackay, L. Rieseberg, J. Travis, and G. Wray, Evolutionary limits and constraints, *The Princeton guide to evolution*, 247 (2014).
- [27] T. R. Gregory, Understanding natural selection: essential concepts and common misconceptions, *Evolution: Education and outreach* **2**, 156 (2009).
- [28] J. Carlin, Mutations are the raw materials of evolution, *Nature Education Knowledge* **3**, 10 (2011).
- [29] R. Hershberg, Mutation—the engine of evolution: studying mutation and its role in the evolution of bacteria, *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology* **7**, a018077 (2015).
- [30] M. Eigen and P. Schuster, Stages of emerging life—five principles of early organization, *Journal of molecular evolution* **19**, 47 (1982).
- [31] J. Hofbauer, The selection mutation equation, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **23**, 41 (1985).
- [32] C. O. Wilke, Quasispecies theory in the context of population genetics, *BMC evolutionary biology* **5**, 1 (2005).
- [33] M. A. Nowak, *Evolutionary dynamics: exploring the equations of life* (Harvard university press, 2006).
- [34] G. Wild and A. Traulsen, The different limits of weak selection and the evolutionary dynamics of finite populations, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **247**, 382 (2007).
- [35] I. F. Spellerberg and P. J. Fedor, A tribute to Claude Shannon (1916–2001) and a plea for more rigorous use of species richness, species diversity and the ‘Shannon–Wiener’ index, *Global ecology and biogeography* **12**, 177 (2003).
- [36] T. M. Cover, *Elements of information theory* (John Wiley & Sons, 1999).
- [37] G. P. Karev, Replicator equations and the principle of minimal production of information, *Bulletin of mathematical biology* **72**, 1124 (2010).
- [38] J. C. Baez and B. S. Pollard, Relative entropy in biological systems, *Entropy* **18**, 46 (2016).
- [39] In the mutation-less case in which $p = \Pi$, Theorem 8 of Ref. [74] implies that $\Delta_{\Pi} I = \Delta I \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \ln^2(N-1) + 1}$. Then, the maximum entropy rate scales as $\max |\dot{S}| \approx \ln N \Delta f / 2$ for large N .
- [40] D. Foster and P. Young, Stochastic evolutionary game dynamics, *Theoretical Population Biology* **38**, 219 (1990).
- [41] P. Czuppon and A. Traulsen, Understanding evolutionary and ecological dynamics using a continuum limit, *Ecology and Evolution* **11**, 5857 (2021).
- [42] T. Bedford and D. L. Hartl, Optimization of gene expression by natural selection, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106**, 1133 (2009).
- [43] K. Jacobs, *Stochastic Processes for Physicists: Understanding Noisy Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [44] It is straightforward to apply these techniques to other Wiener-noise dynamical models [40, 75, 76], see the Appendix for one such example.
- [45] I. M. Rouzine, J. Wakeley, and J. M. Coffin, The solitary wave of asexual evolution, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**, 587 (2003).
- [46] M. M. Desai and D. S. Fisher, Beneficial Mutation-Selection Balance and the Effect of Linkage on Positive Selection, *Genetics* **176**, 1759 (2007), <https://academic.oup.com/genetics/article-pdf/176/3/1759/49404489/genetics1759.pdf>.
- [47] P. D. Sniegowski and P. J. Gerrish, Beneficial mutations and the dynamics of adaptation in asexual populations, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **365**, 1255 (2010).
- [48] S. F. Levy, J. R. Blundell, S. Venkataram, D. A. Petrov, D. S. Fisher, and G. Sherlock, Quantitative evolutionary dynamics using high-resolution lineage tracking, *Nature* **519**, 181 (2015).
- [49] Z. Gong and R. Hamazaki, Bounds in nonequilibrium quantum dynamics (2022), [arXiv:2202.02011 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.02011).
- [50] N. Carabba, N. Hörnedal, and A. del Campo, Quantum speed limits on operator flows and correlation functions, *Quantum* **6**, 884 (2022).
- [51] J. Uffink and J. Van Lith, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations, *Foundations of physics* **29**, 655 (1999).
- [52] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for biomolecular processes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [53] V. T. Vo, T. Van Vu, and Y. Hasegawa, Unified approach to classical speed limit and thermodynamic uncertainty relation, *Phys. Rev. E* **102**, 062132 (2020).
- [54] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations constrain non-equilibrium fluctuations, *Nature Physics* **16**, 15 (2020).
- [55] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, Improving thermodynamic bounds using correlations, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 041061 (2021).
- [56] S. Das and J. R. Green, Speed limits on deterministic chaos and dissipation, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, L012016 (2023).
- [57] R. Marsland III, W. Cui, and J. M. Horowitz, The thermodynamic uncertainty relation in biochemical oscillations, *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **16**, 20190098 (2019).
- [58] A. Genthon and D. Lacoste, Universal constraints on selection strength in lineage trees, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 023187 (2021).
- [59] L. P. García-Pintos, L. T. Brady, J. Bringewatt, and Y.-K. Liu, Lower bounds on quantum annealing times, *Phys.*

- Rev. Lett. **130**, 140601 (2023).
- [60] W. F. Basener and J. C. Sanford, The fundamental theorem of natural selection with mutations, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **76**, 1589 (2018).
- [61] K. Adachi, R. Iritani, and R. Hamazaki, Universal constraint on nonlinear population dynamics, *Communications Physics* **5**, 1 (2022).
- [62] N. Colegrave, Sex releases the speed limit on evolution, *Nature* **420**, 664 (2002).
- [63] C. M. Dmitriew, The evolution of growth trajectories: what limits growth rate?, *Biological Reviews* **86**, 97 (2011), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2010.00136.x>.
- [64] A. R. Evans, D. Jones, A. G. Boyer, J. H. Brown, D. P. Costa, S. M. Ernest, E. M. Fitzgerald, M. Fortelius, J. L. Gittleman, M. J. Hamilton, *et al.*, The maximum rate of mammal evolution, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 4187 (2012).
- [65] M. Frean, P. B. Rainey, and A. Traulsen, The effect of population structure on the rate of evolution, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **280**, 20130211 (2013).
- [66] J. Tkadlec, A. Pavlogiannis, K. Chatterjee, and M. A. Nowak, Population structure determines the tradeoff between fixation probability and fixation time, *Communications biology* **2**, 138 (2019).
- [67] J. F. Crow and N. E. Morton, Measurement of gene frequency drift in small populations, *Evolution* **9**, 202 (1955).
- [68] A. Traulsen and C. Hauert, Stochastic evolutionary game dynamics, in *Reviews of Nonlinear Dynamics and Complexity* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2009) Chap. 2, pp. 25–61.
- [69] P. Tataru, M. Simonsen, T. Bataillon, and A. Hobolth, Statistical Inference in the Wright-Fisher Model Using Allele Frequency Data, *Systematic Biology* **66**, e30 (2016).
- [70] W. Huang, C. Hauert, and A. Traulsen, Stochastic game dynamics under demographic fluctuations, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 9064 (2015).
- [71] V. V. Vasconcelos, F. P. Santos, F. C. Santos, and J. M. Pacheco, Stochastic dynamics through hierarchically embedded markov chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 058301 (2017).
- [72] D. Whitley, A genetic algorithm tutorial, *Statistics and computing* **4**, 65 (1994).
- [73] X. Yu and M. Gen, *Introduction to evolutionary algorithms* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2010).
- [74] D. Reeb and M. M. Wolf, Tight bound on relative entropy by entropy difference, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **61**, 1458 (2015).
- [75] A. Cabrales, Stochastic replicator dynamics, *International Economic Review* **41**, 451 (2000).
- [76] T.-J. Feng, C. Li, X.-D. Zheng, S. Lessard, and Y. Tao, Stochastic replicator dynamics and evolutionary stability, *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 044403 (2022).
-

APPENDIX

In the Appendices, I include detailed proofs of Eqs. (2), (8), (10), (13), and (14) in the main text. I also show that the techniques developed in this article can be applied to other dynamical models that incorporate stochastic forces, and illustrate the rate limits for the replicator-mutator equation on a toy model.

Appendix A: Rate limits for arbitrary evolutionary dynamics

In this Appendix I prove Eq. (2) in the main text and I show that the variance in the rate growth of a population equals the classical Fisher information of the probability distribution of the population.

Let n_j be the time-dependent population of species j and $N := \sum_j n_j$, so that $\{p_j := n_j/N\}$ is a normalized distribution. The rate of change of the average $\langle A \rangle := \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} a_j$ over the population satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle A \rangle - \langle \dot{A} \rangle &= \sum_j a_j \frac{\dot{n}_j}{N} - \frac{\dot{N}}{N} \sum_j a_j \frac{n_j}{N} = \sum_j a_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} - \frac{\dot{N}}{N} \langle A \rangle = \sum_j \delta a_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} + \langle A \rangle \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} - \frac{\dot{N}}{N} \langle A \rangle \\ &= \sum_j \delta a_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} = \sum_j \delta a_j \frac{n_j}{N} r_j = \sum_j \delta a_j \frac{n_j}{N} \delta r_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where I denote $\delta a_j := a_j - \langle A \rangle$ and $\delta r_j := r_j - \langle r \rangle$, with $r_j := \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j}$. In the last step I used that $\langle r \rangle \sum_j \delta a_j n_j / N = 0$ given that $\langle \delta A \rangle = 0$.

That is,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle A \rangle - \langle \dot{A} \rangle = \sum_j \delta a_j \delta r_j \frac{n_j}{N} = \text{cov}(r, A), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the covariance is defined by $\text{cov}(r, A) := \langle \delta A \delta r \rangle$.

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality then leads to

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \langle A \rangle - \langle \dot{A} \rangle \right| = |\text{cov}(r, A)| \leq \Delta r \Delta A, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\Delta A := \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2}$ denotes the standard deviation of A . Equation (A3) implies that, for any trait A , evolution of the mean is fast only if A or r are uncertain – i.e., their uncertainties Δr and ΔA cannot be small for fast evolution.

Defining the normalized probability distribution $p_j := n_j/N$ and using that $\dot{p}_j = \dot{n}_j/N - n_j \dot{N}/N^2$, it holds that

$$\frac{\dot{p}_j}{p_j} = \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} - \frac{\dot{N}}{N}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_F &:= \sum_j p_j \left(\frac{\dot{p}_j}{p_j} \right)^2 = \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \left(\frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} - \frac{\dot{N}}{N} \right)^2 = \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \left(\frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} \right)^2 - 2 \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} \frac{\dot{N}}{N} + \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{N}^2}{N^2} = \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \left(\frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\dot{N}}{N} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \left(\frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} \right)^2 - \left(\sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} \frac{\dot{n}_j}{n_j} \right)^2 = \sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} r_j^2 - \left(\sum_j \frac{n_j}{N} r_j \right)^2 = \langle r^2 \rangle - \langle r \rangle^2 \equiv (\Delta r)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

That is, the variance in the rate r equals the Fisher information of the normalized probability distribution $p_j := n_j/N$. Note, too, that Eq. (A4) implies that $\text{cov}(A, r) = \text{cov}(A, f)$ for dynamics governed by the replicator equation.

Appendix B: Limits to evolutionary processes with mutations

In this section I prove Equations (8) and (10) in the main text.

Let $\delta_{\Pi} a_j := a_j - \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}$ and $\delta f_j := f_j - \langle f \rangle$, where $\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} := \sum_j \Pi_j a_j$ and $\langle f \rangle := \sum_j p_j f_j$ are means with respect to the distribution Π with components $\Pi := \sum_k p_k Q_{kj}$ and the distribution p , respectively. Then, using conservation of probability (which implies $\sum_j \dot{p}_j \langle A \rangle_{\Pi} = 0$) and the mutator-replicator equation, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle &= \sum_j \dot{p}_j a_j = \sum_j \dot{p}_j \delta_{\Pi} a_j \\
&= \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j - \sum_j p_j \delta_{\Pi} a_j \langle f \rangle \\
&= \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \delta f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j + \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \langle f \rangle p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j - \langle f \rangle \langle A \rangle + \langle f \rangle \langle A \rangle_{\Pi} \\
&= \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \delta f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j + \langle f \rangle \sum_j \Pi_j \delta_{\Pi} a_j - \langle f \rangle \langle A \rangle + \langle f \rangle \langle A \rangle_{\Pi} \\
&= \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \delta f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j - \langle f \rangle (\langle A \rangle - \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}). \tag{B1}
\end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality says that $\sum_{\alpha} X_{\alpha} Y_{\alpha} \leq \sqrt{(\sum_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}^2)(\sum_{\alpha} Y_{\alpha}^2)}$. Applying it to the first term in the last line, with $X_{\alpha} = \sqrt{Q_{kj}} \delta f_k \sqrt{p_k}$ and $Y_{\alpha} = \sqrt{Q_{kj} p_k} \delta_{\Pi} a_j$ where α denotes both indexes $\{j, k\}$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \delta f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j \right)^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{jk} Q_{kj} (\delta f_k)^2 p_k \right) \left(\sum_{jk} Q_{kj} p_k (\delta_{\Pi} a_j)^2 \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_k (\delta f_k)^2 p_k \right) \left(\sum_j \Pi_k (\delta_{\Pi} a_j)^2 \right) = (\Delta f)^2 (\Delta_{\Pi} A)^2, \tag{B2}
\end{aligned}$$

where I used that $\sum_j Q_{kj} = 1$. Combining Eqs. (B1) and (B2) leads to

$$\left| \frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle - \langle f \rangle (\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle) \right| = \left| \sum_{jk} Q_{kj} \delta f_k p_k \delta_{\Pi} a_j \right| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f, \tag{B3}$$

which proves Equation (8) in the main text

Choosing a trait with components $a_j \equiv I_j = -\ln p_j$ gives:

$$\langle A \rangle = \sum_j p_j (-\ln p_j) = S \tag{B4}$$

$$\langle A \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle A \rangle = \sum_j \Pi_j (-\ln p_j) - \sum_j p_j (-\ln p_j) = S(p||\Pi). \tag{B5}$$

Using that $\langle \dot{A} \rangle = \sum_j p_j (-\dot{p}_j/p_j) = -\sum_j \dot{p}_j = 0$ yields Equation (10) in the main text.

Appendix C: Limits to stochastic evolutionary processes

In this section I prove Equation (13) in the main text.

Consider a stochastic replicator-mutator equation

$$dp_j = \sum_k p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) dt + p_j \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right) \tag{C1}$$

where σ_j characterizes the strength of the stochastic driving forces for population j , and dW_j are Wiener noises, which satisfy $\overline{dW_j dW_k} = \delta_{jk} dt$ and $\overline{dW_j^2} = dt$.

Let us focus on the noise-averaged change in an expectation value over a time τ relative to the change

$$[d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle] \Big|_{\text{replicator-mutator}} = \sum_j a_j dp_j \Big|_{\text{replicator-mutator}} = \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt \quad (\text{C2})$$

in $\langle A \rangle$ due state changes from natural selection and mutations, as modeled by the replicator-mutator equation. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \left(d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt \right) \right|^2} &= \overline{\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \left(\sum_j dp_j a_j - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) \delta a_j dt \right) \right|^2} \\ &= \overline{\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \left(\sum_j \delta a_j (dp_j - \sum_k p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) dt) \right) \right|^2} \\ &= \overline{\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \sum_j \delta a_j p_j \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right) \right|^2} \\ &= \overline{\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \sum_j \delta a_j p_j Y_j \right|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau^2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k Y_j Y_k}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

where I used that $\delta a_j := a_j - \langle a \rangle$, that probability is conserved, $\sum_j dp_j = 0$, and Eq. (C1). Here,

$$Y_j := \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right). \quad (\text{C4})$$

In order to prevent confusion, I explicitly include the time-dependence of the noise terms. For Wiener processes, it holds that $\overline{dW_j^t dW_j^{t'}} = \delta_{jk} \delta_{tt'}$, and that the noise terms are independent from all other functions (in the Itô picture), so that $\overline{p_j^t dW_j^t} = \overline{p_j^{t'} dW_j^{t'}} = 0$. The integrals that lack a line element dt , proportional to a noise term, correspond to Itô integrals [43].

Using the rules of Itô calculus described above and that $\sum_j \delta a_j p_j = 0$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k Y_j Y_k} &= \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j \sigma_k dW_j^t dW_k^{t'}} \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j dW_j^t \sum_l p_l \sigma_l dW_l^{t'}} \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \left(\sum_l p_l \sigma_l dW_l^t \right) \left(\sum_m p_m \sigma_m dW_m^{t'} \right)} \\ &= \int_0^\tau \sum_j \overline{(\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2} dt - 2 \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j p_j \sigma_j} dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \left(\sum_l p_l^2 \sigma_l^2 \right)} dt \\ &= \int_0^\tau \sum_j \overline{(\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

Combining Eq. (C3) and (C5) results in

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt\right)^2} &= \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2 dt} \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 p_j^2 dt} \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 p_j dt} \\
&= \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty^2}{\tau} \frac{1}{\tau} \overline{\int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}. \tag{C6}
\end{aligned}$$

This follows from $\sigma_j \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty := \max_j \{\sigma_j\}$ and $p_j^2 \leq p_j$. This proves Eq. (13) in the main text.

1. Limits under other stochastic dynamics

An alternative stochastic replicator equation of the form

$$dp_j = p_j \left(f_j - \langle f \rangle - \sigma_j^2 p_j + \sum_l \sigma_l^2 p_l^2 \right) dt + p_j \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right) \tag{C7}$$

was derived in Ref. [75]. For simplicity I assume no mutations in this sub-appendix, but it is easy to generalize the results that follow to account for them. Here, σ_j characterizes the strength of the stochastic driving forces for population j , and dW_j are Wiener noises, which satisfy $dW_j dW_k = \delta_{jk} dt$ and $dW_j^2 = dt$.

Consider the noise-averaged change in an expectation value over a time τ , relative to the change $[d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle]_{\text{replicator}} = \text{cov}(A, f) dt$ in $\langle A \rangle$ due state changes from natural selection as modeled by the replicator equation.

Following similar calculations as above, one finds that all cross terms proportional to a single noise term vanish upon averaging, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \text{cov}(A, f) dt\right)^2} &= \frac{1}{\tau^2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k (dp_j - p_j \delta f_j dt) (dp_k - p_k \delta f_k dt')} \\
&= \frac{1}{\tau^2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k (p_j X_j - p_j \delta f_j) (p_k X_k - p_k \delta f_k) dt dt'} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\tau^2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k Y_j Y_k}, \tag{C8}
\end{aligned}$$

by using that $dp_j = p_j X_j dt + p_j Y_j$, with the notation

$$X_j := \left(f_j - \langle f \rangle - \sigma_j^2 p_j + \sum_l \sigma_l^2 p_l^2 \right) = \left(\delta f_j - \sigma_j^2 p_j + \sum_l \sigma_l^2 p_l^2 \right) \tag{C9}$$

$$Y_j := \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right). \tag{C10}$$

Then, using the rules of Itô calculus described above and that $\sum_j \delta a_j p_j = 0$ gives that the second term is

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k Y_j Y_k} &= \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j \sigma_k dW_j^t dW_k^{t'}} \\
&- 2 \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j dW_j^t \sum_l p_l \sigma_l dW_l^{t'}} \\
&+ \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \left(\sum_l p_l \sigma_l dW_l^t \right) \left(\sum_m p_m \sigma_m dW_m^{t'} \right)} \\
&= \int_0^\tau \sum_j \overline{(\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2} dt - 2 \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \sigma_j p_j \sigma_j} dt \\
&+ \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \left(\sum_l p_l^2 \sigma_l^2 \right)} dt \\
&= \int_0^\tau \sum_j \overline{(\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2} dt. \tag{C11}
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the first term becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\tau^2} \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k (p_j X_j - p_j \delta f_j) (p_k X_k - p_k \delta f_k)} dt dt' \\
= \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} \overline{\delta a_j \delta a_k p_j p_k \left(-\sigma_j^2 p_j + \sum_l \sigma_l^2 p_l^2 \right) \left(-\sigma_k^2 p_k + \sum_m \sigma_m^2 p_m^2 \right)} dt dt' \\
= \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau \left(\left(\sum_j p_j^2 \sigma_j^2 \delta a_j \right) \left(\sum_k p_k^2 \sigma_k^2 \delta a_k \right) \right) dt dt' \\
= \left[\int_0^\tau \left(\sum_j p_j^2 \sigma_j^2 \delta a_j \right) dt \right]^2, \tag{C12}
\end{aligned}$$

where I used that $\sum_j p_j \delta a_j = 0$ in the third line.

Combining the previous two equations gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \text{cov}(A, f) dt \right)^2} &= \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\left(\int_0^\tau \sum_j p_j^2 \sigma_j^2 \delta a_j dt \right)^2} + \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 \sigma_j^2 p_j^2 dt} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\left(\int_0^\tau \sqrt{\sum_j p_j^2 \sigma_j^4} \sqrt{\sum_k p_k^2 (\delta a_k)^2} dt \right)^2} + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 p_j^2 dt} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\left(\int_0^\tau \sqrt{\sum_j p_j \sigma_j^4} \sqrt{\sum_k p_k (\delta a_k)^2} dt \right)^2} + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_j (\delta a_j)^2 p_j dt} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \Delta A \sqrt{\langle \sigma^4 \rangle} dt \right)^2 + \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty^2}{\tau} \frac{1}{\tau} \overline{\int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}. \tag{C13}
\end{aligned}$$

The second line follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and from $\sigma_j \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty := \max_j \{\sigma_j\}$, and the third line holds because $p_j^2 \leq p_j$.

Note that the first term dominates the upper bound for long times $\tau \gg \|\sigma\|_\infty^2$.

A looser bound holds by using that $\langle \sigma^4 \rangle \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty^4$,

$$\overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \text{cov}(A, f) dt \right)^2} \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty^4 \overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \Delta A dt \right)^2} + \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty^2}{\tau} \frac{1}{\tau} \overline{\int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}. \tag{C14}$$

This proves an equation analogous to Eq. (13) in the main text for the stochastic replicator equation (C7).

An analogous constrain holds when mutations are included,

$$dp_j = p_j \left(\sum_k p_k f_k Q_{kj} - p_j \langle f \rangle - \sigma_j^2 p_j + \sum_l \sigma_l^2 p_l^2 \right) dt + p_j \left(\sigma_j dW_j - \sum_l \sigma_l p_l dW_l \right), \quad (\text{C15})$$

in which case

$$\overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k (f_k - \langle f \rangle) Q_{kj} a_j dt \right)^2} \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty^4 \overline{\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \Delta A dt \right)^2} + \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty^2}{\tau} \overline{\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}. \quad (\text{C16})$$

Appendix D: Rate limits under natural selection, mutations, and genetic drift

In this appendix I prove Equation (14) in the main text.

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \overline{\int_0^\tau (d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle)} - \overline{\int_0^\tau \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt} \right| &\leq \overline{\left| \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt \right|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\overline{\left| \int_0^\tau d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle - \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j dt \right|^2}} \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_\infty \sqrt{\overline{\int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where I used the triangle inequality in the first line, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the second line, and bound (C6) in the third line.

The rate limit (B3), derived for the replicator-mutator equation, says that the replicator-mutator contribution to the change in A satisfies

$$\left| \sum_{jk} p_k Q_{kj} (f_k - \langle f \rangle) a_j \right| = \left| \left[\frac{d\langle A \rangle}{dt} - \langle \dot{A} \rangle \right]_{\text{replicator-mutator}} \right| \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$\leq \langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_\Pi - \langle A \rangle| + \Delta_\Pi A \Delta f. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Then,

$$\overline{\left| \int_0^\tau (d\langle A \rangle - \langle dA \rangle) \right|} \leq \overline{\int_0^\tau \Delta_\Pi A \Delta f dt} + \overline{\int_0^\tau \langle f \rangle |\langle A \rangle_\Pi - \langle A \rangle| dt} + \|\sigma\|_\infty \sqrt{\overline{\int_0^\tau (\Delta A)^2 dt}}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

This proves Eq. (14) in the main text.

Appendix E: Mathematical toy models to illustrate the bounds




FIG. 3. **Evolutionary rate limits.** I consider a toy model where $N = 7$ species, initially with equal populations, mutate to two neighboring variants $j \rightarrow \{j - 1, j + 1\}$ at rates $Q_{j,j-1} = 0.1\kappa$ and $Q_{j,j+1} = \kappa$. While the replicator-mutator Eq. (6) governs the evolution of the populations, the lower and upper rate limits Eq. (9a) and (9b) constrain the dynamics of the species' quantitative traits in terms of expectation values and standard deviations. For illustration purposes, I consider a phenotype A (e.g., the flagella length of bacteria) whose values are not affected by the mutations [inset (1a)] and a phenotype B (e.g., bacteria's mass) that changes on the mutated species [inset (1b)]. [Left column] For the mutation-robust phenotype A , it holds that $\langle A \rangle = \langle A \rangle_{\Pi}$, so the upper rate limit Eq. (9b) implies that $|d\langle A \rangle / dt| \leq \Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f$. Then, an homogeneous fitness landscape (weak-selection regime) for which $\Delta f \ll 1$ [inset (2a)] results in slower changes in the phenotype [plot (i)] than the fast rates [plot (iii)] obtained with a diverse fitness profile (natural selection regime) for which $\Delta f \gg 1$ [inset (2b)]. [Center column] The mutation-sensitive phenotype B can evolve more rapidly than phenotype A due to the contribution of the term $\langle f \rangle |\langle B \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle B \rangle|$ to the upper rate limit Eq. (9b). When the mutation-driven term $\langle f \rangle |\langle B \rangle_{\Pi} - \langle B \rangle|$ is larger than the natural selection contribution $\Delta_{\Pi} A \Delta f$, the lower rate limit Eq. (9a) further constraints the minimum rates [plot (ii)]. The lower rate limits do not appear plots (i,iii,iv) since they are negative in those regimes. This example illustrates how the rate limits derived in this paper can be used to discriminate rapidly evolving traits from slowly evolving ones.