

# THE MATHEMATICS OF EVOLUTION: THE PRICE EQUATION, NATURAL SELECTION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

TOM LAGATTA

**ABSTRACT.** George Price introduced his famous equation to study selective and environmental effects in discrete populations. We extend Price’s evolutionary framework to the measure-theoretic and quantum cases, showing that all evolutionary processes decompose into selective and environmental components. We also extend Fisher’s fundamental theorem, showing that selective change of relative fitness equals the variance of relative fitness.

To further quantify selective and environmental effects, we introduce selective and environmental entropy functionals. Selective entropy is non-positive, representing biological negentropy, and environmental entropy is non-negative, representing physical entropy. The selective entropy vanishes if and only if the selective change operator vanishes, and environmental entropy vanishes if and only if the environmental change operator vanishes. The environmental entropy further decomposes into dispersion and mixing entropies, which in general are not realized by change operators.

We prove four novel Laws of Natural Selection, showing that selection consistently acts in a manner to increase selection, but which can be disrupted by environmental change. Our methodology is to apply convex analysis to variance and entropy functionals and their selective changes, a technique which applies to both theoretical models and empirical data. These laws are inspired by but distinct from the classical Thermodynamic Laws.

Our Zeroth Law is a refinement of Fisher’s theorem, showing that variance of relative fitness is bounded below by  $1/p_* - 1$ , for  $p_*$  the proportion of the child-bearing population. This inequality is saturated in the case of “life and death” selective-equilibrium populations, and otherwise is a strict inequality for non-equilibrium populations. Our First Law shows that selective acceleration of relative fitness is also bounded by a non-negative quantity, which is optimized for the same selective-equilibrium populations. This is a non-conservative, selective version of the Thermodynamic First Law. These results show that natural selection speeds up natural selection, regardless of biological, physical, or mathematical domain.

Our Second Law shows that the selective change of selective entropy and its selective acceleration are similarly bounded by non-positive constants, and these inequalities are saturated in the selective equilibrium case. This is a formal, rigorous version of the Thermodynamic Second Law, specialized to the case of selective entropy always growing under natural selection.

We also introduce a class of environmental-equilibrium processes, where dispersion and mixing effects are perfectly balanced. Our Third Law shows that for environmental-equilibrium processes, selective change of environmental entropy vanishes, and for non-equilibrium processes, it may vary in a certain open window around zero. The environmental-equilibrium case corresponds to “zero temperature” processes, and thus this is a selective version of the Third Law of Thermodynamics: environmental entropy is constant under selection only when environmental temperature is at absolute zero.

---

*E-mail address:* tlagatta@gmail.com.

*Date:* December 6, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 92D15.

*Key words and phrases.* evolution, Price equation, natural selection, environmental change, entropy, population dynamics.

## CONTENTS

<b>Part 1. The Price Equation and Its Consequences</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Introduction	3
2. The General Price Equation and Fisher’s Fundamental Theorem	14
3. Selective Equilibrium and the Zeroth Law of Natural Selection	19
4. “Pure” Processes and the Price Representation Theorem	20
5. Selective Change of Variance and the First Law of Natural Selection	23
6. Environmental Change of Variance	25
7. Multi-Level Price Equation	27
8. Smooth Price Equation	28
9. Quantum Price Equation	30
10. Open Evolutionary Processes and the Kerr-Godfrey-Smith Equation	35
<b>Part 2. Selective Entropy (Kullback-Leibler Divergence of Relative Fitness)</b>	<b>37</b>
11. Definition of Selective Entropy and Gibbs’s Inequalities	37
12. Selective Change of Selective Entropy and the Second Law of Natural Selection	39
13. Environmental Change of Selective Entropy	45
14. Multi-Level Selective Entropy	46
15. Quantum Selective Entropy	47
<b>Part 3. Environmental Entropy (One-Step Kolmogorov-Sinai Entropy)</b>	<b>48</b>
16. Definitions of Environmental Entropy and Total Entropy	48
17. Dispersion Entropy and Mixing Entropy	51
18. Vanishing Entropies: Efficiency, Consistency, Reversibility, and Irreversibility	55
19. Environmental Equilibrium and Bounds on Dispersion and Mixing Entropies	56
20. Selective Change of Environmental Entropy and the Third Law of Natural Selection	60
21. Environmental Change of Environmental Entropy	62
22. Multi-Level Environmental Entropy	63
23. Quantum Environmental Entropy	63
24. Conclusion	66
References	66
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>71</b>
Appendix A. Proof of Quantum Jensen’s Inequality (Lemma 9.8)	71
Appendix B. Proof of Generalized Sinai’s Theorem (Theorem 16.4)	71
Appendix C. Proof of Non-Positivity of Local Selective Entropy (Lemma 16.6)	73
Appendix D. Proof of Generalized Sinai’s Theorem for Dispersion and Mixing Entropies (Theorem 17.6)	73
Appendix E. Proofs of Efficiency, Consistency, Reversibility, and Irreversibility Theorems (Theorems 18.1-18.4)	74
Appendix F. Proof of Strong Third Law of Natural Selection (Theorem 20.4)	80

## Part 1. The Price Equation and Its Consequences

### 1. INTRODUCTION

George Price introduced his famous equation [Pri70, (4)] to analyze evolutionary processes acting on discrete populations. The Price equation states that any change decomposes into “natural selection” and “environmental change”. We extend Price’s equation to the general measure-theoretic and quantum cases, decomposing evolutionary transition kernels into selective and environmental components. The general effect of natural selection is to grow and scale population sizes, and environmental change is to redistribute those populations.

We introduce novel entropy functionals to further quantify the amount of selection and environmental change of a process. We define the selective entropy as the Kullback-Leibler divergence of relative fitness, modeling biological effects of growth and variation of fitness. This selective entropy (or “negentropy”) is non-positive, and vanishes for purely environmental processes. We define environmental entropy as the one-step Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy of a process, modeling physical effects of dispersion and mixing of populations. Environmental entropy is non-negative, and vanishes for purely environmental processes.

Fisher’s theorem states that selective change of relative fitness (the selective velocity) is the variance of relative fitness. We present four Laws of Natural Selection extending Fisher’s theorem, showing that selective functionals tend to be monotone under the act of selection. Thus “selection begets selection” in the absence of environmental effects, with selective effects amplifying over time, and environmental effects either disrupting or amplifying selection.

We apply an optimization perspective to the Price equation, and prove four novel Laws of Natural Selection. Our Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2) extends Fisher’s theorem, providing a lower bound for selective velocity of  $1/p_* - 1$ , where  $p_*$  is the proportion of child-bearing population, which is strengthened by Corollary 11.5. These bounds are saturated when the process is in “selective equilibrium”: the Darwinian life-or-death processes where fitness is either zero or non-zero. Thus any two processes in selective-equilibrium with same  $p_*$  have the same variance of relative fitness, in analogy with the Thermodynamic Zeroth Law.

Our First Law (Theorem 5.3) shows that the selective change of relative variance (the selective acceleration) is non-negative, with a lower bound given by variance times second-moment of fitness. This bound is saturated again in selective equilibrium. Consequently, selective non-equilibrium processes tend to “speed up” and become more selective over multiple iterations, though this selective acceleration can be disrupted or amplified by environmental effects.

Our Second Law (Theorem 12.3) shows that the selective change of selective entropy is non-positive, amplifying selective effects since selective entropy is itself non-positive. The bounds are saturated in selective equilibrium, meaning that selective non-equilibrium processes become more selectively entropic over time. This is a selective form of the Second Law of Thermodynamics: selective entropy is monotonic under the act of selection.

We identify a case called environmental equilibrium, corresponding to processes whose dispersive and mixing effects are perfectly balanced. Our Third Laws (Theorem 20.1, 20.4) show that for environmental-equilibrium processes, selective change of environmental entropy vanishes, and otherwise it may fluctuate in a certain open window around zero. This models selective and environmental interactions. Environmental equilibrium corresponds to “zero temperature” processes, or systems at absolute zero. Thus this result is an selective

version of the Third Law of Thermodynamics: environmental entropy is constant under selection only when environmental temperature is at absolute zero.

We derive similar results in the case of quantum processes, showing that the evolutionary framework covers both classical and quantum systems. We also prove a version of the Price equation in the case of open processes.

**1.1. Literature Review.** The statistician Ronald A. Fisher was the first to introduce a quantitative theory of selection. Fisher’s “fundamental theorem” stated ambiguously that “the rate of increase in fitness of any organism at any time is equal to its genetic variance in fitness at that time” [Fis30, p. 35], [Fis58, p. 37]. Fisher claimed his theorem was a biological version of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, in that “natural selection requires a ‘reservoir’ of additive genetic variance” [Plu06]. However, an exact quantitative reading of Fisher’s statement eluded the biology community until the work of Price in the 1970s. Price [Pri70] recognized that Fisher’s statement could be quantified as population covariance against fitness. This enabled him to convert Fisher’s regression statistics [Fis30] into a discrete probabilistic framework, substituting populations for probability. Robertson [Rob66] independently identified the covariance formula in his work on dairy farming.

Price stated his eponymous equation as [Pri70, (4)], decomposing arbitrary change into two terms and nothing else, which later [Pri72a] he would describe as selective change and environmental change. Fisher’s fundamental theorem follows as an immediate consequence: the selective change of relative fitness is equal to its variance. In Price’s view, “The main cause of misunderstanding about the theorem is that everyone has supposed that Fisher was talking about the total change rather than just the fraction of this due to natural selection” [Pri72a, p. 130]. In [Pri71a], Price provides a formal extension of the Hardy-Weinberg mating law using his framework. In the posthumous [Pri71b], Price argues for a general theory of selection and frames what some of its properties might be. In [Pri72b], Price further extended the covariance-selection mathematics to the multi-level and continuous-time cases.

Price hoped to build a theory of altruism [Har11]. He worked with Maynard Smith [PS72, SP73] on evolutionary stable strategies, and he communicated with Hamilton [Ham96] who used the covariance-selection mathematics to build a unified theory of kin selection [Ham70] and group selection [Ham75] using the Price equation.

Price’s work lingered in the annals of evolutionary biology as an interesting sidenote, enabling many authors to apply the general theory to their mathematical models of interest (cf. e.g., [Ham70, Lew74, CN76, Gra85, Mic00, LH01, Fox06]). The research program of Frank has centered the Price equation at forefront of evolutionary theory [Fra85, Fra86b, Fra95, Fra97, Fra09, Fra18]. Frank [Fra86a, Fra87, Fra92] shows how to apply the Price equation to evolutionary-stable strategies, by taking a variational derivative of the Price equation in a manifold of parametrized model constraints. This has enabled Frank to show that natural selection maximizes Fisher information [Fra12], that the Price equation is equivalent to d’Alembert’s principle in physics [Fra15], and that the Price equation is equivalent to the statistical equation of model of Nicholson et al. [NGPdCG20, FB20].

Page and Nowak [PN02] show that the Price equation in continuous settings is equivalent to the Replicator-Mutator and Lotka-Volterra equations. Most common biological mechanisms (e.g., genetic, epigenetic, behavioral, and symbolic) can be expressed in a unified manner using the Price equation; see [HU10] and [LOH20]. Rice [Ric08, Ric20] describes stochastic evolutionary processes with the multi-level Price equation. Week et al. [WNHK21]

present a stochastic partial differential equation version of the Price equation for a Gaussian allelic model of mutation, approximating large populations of discrete individuals by diffusion limits.

Nowak & Highfield [NH11] criticize the universal applicability of the Price equation as a mere tautology. Frank [Fra09, Fra12] counters that this is a strength of the Price equation. To better understand total change of a process, we transform it into selective and environmental parts, calculate and reason about each separately, then use the Price equation to combine insights additively, e.g., by summing equalities or inequalities. We cannot expect a general mathematical theorem to have explanatory power in and of itself, but we can use it as a vessel for interpreting empirical data and conclusions about real-world phenomena.

Grafen and Batty et al. [Gra00, Gra07, BCGG14, Gra15] have built an topological-analytical framework for working with Price’s equation and Fisher’s fundamental theorem, based on measure theory with common topological assumptions (in particular, Borel measurability). An early paper of Grafen [Gra02] considered the case of arbitrary measurable populations, related by an integral kernel  $w_i(di) = \frac{1}{N} \int w(i, i')\mu'(di')$  with unspecified regularity assumptions, and only considered the selective change, not the full Price equation.

Kerr and Godfrey-Smith [KGS09] relax the assumption that all children be accounted for by parents, and prove an extended Price equation with a third term for those orphaned children. Brown and Field [BF21] recognize that this has novel interpretations around migration and mixed asexual/sexual reproduction.

Luque et al. [LB21, BL21] argue for the Price equation at the center of a general theory of evolution, including cultural evolutionary theory. Aguilar and Akçay [AA18] use the multi-level Price equation to analyze processes in terms of genetic and cultural factors. Reiskind et al. [RMB<sup>+</sup>21] use the Price equation to describe the selective change of trait and allele frequencies across generations.

**1.2. Justification of Abstraction and Biological Examples.** Before we present the abstract framework for the Price equation, we share a brief justification for why this level of abstraction is useful, and discuss some biological implications. Historically, Price’s discrete framework has helped scientists analyze simple populations of differentiated individuals, and revealed new biological insights. In the study of more complex systems like continuous, hierarchical, and stochastic populations, researchers have introduced alternative versions of the Price equation, as described in Section 1.1.

While these models are each useful in their specific domains, approximations become difficult when dealing with complex multi-scale systems, especially those with very small and very large scales. For example, metacognition arises from competing evolutionary time scales, and has resisted a quantitative modeling via the Price equation [KFL22]. Measure theory provides an effective way to integrate different models of the Price equation into a coherent whole, as illustrated by Grafen [Gra02, Sect 2.4]:

The first reason to be general is to show that the optimization link with natural selection is not just a coincidence in a special case, but a fundamental fact about a class of selection processes. Furthermore, the formal Darwinism unification project aims to provide a technical representation of the common-sense, informal, arguments first proposed by Darwin (1859), and accepted by generations of biologists since. The formal argument should work in the same way for finite and infinite populations; for haploid populations, diploid populations and mixtures; for one-, two- and multi-locus traits; and for cases with

and without environmental stochasticity, with finite or infinite sets of possible environments. Darwin did not take these cases separately, and neither should we. It is worth noting that, although the apparatus is complex, the argument is simple, reflecting the persuasive nature of the original verbal argument.

Another advantage of generality is that the theoretical developments here can be viewed as “meta-models”, that is, as models of models. The aim is to show that a wide class of existing population genetic models admit of an optimization interpretation, and to show how to construct the corresponding optimization model. This purpose is fulfilled in proportion to the generality of the model.

Finally, the model is not yet general enough. A general argument provides a better source for further development than a special case. For example, inclusive fitness and ESS theory could be incorporated with careful extensions of the model, and ideally both would be incorporated simultaneously.

Our abstract framework takes Grafen’s next steps of generalization. In Part 1, we describe inclusive fitness via an evolutionary transition mapping (2.1), categorizing and quantifying all measurable parent-child relationships in rearing. We show that natural selection is given by absolutely continuous scalings of measures, and environmental change by Markov chains, familiar tools to applied mathematicians. Our Zeroth Law bounds the selective velocity, and the First Law bounds the selective acceleration. These laws quantify how quickly selection speeds up the process of selection.

In Parts 2 and 3, we introduce an optimization theory based on new entropy functionals, quantifying the degree of selective and environmental change of a process. These entropies satisfy universal quantitative law: our Second Law further quantifies how selective change drives selection, and our Third Law shows how environmental change amplifies or counters selection. We also extend these laws into the quantum realm, which has implications for selection in quantum biology [LCC<sup>+</sup>13, CCC<sup>+</sup>20]. The primary method we use throughout our analysis is Jensen’s inequality, as applied to convex and concave entropy functionals and their changes.

The equilibrium cases for the entropy optimization inequalities correspond to evolutionarily stable strategies. These are characterized by the saturation condition for Jensen’s inequality, meaning that we do not have to compute partial differential equations to solve for the variational principle. With additional specifications on the model, these equilibrium cases can be analyzed using calculus and methods from evolutionary game theory. Thus the entropy functionals provides a measure of model fit to empirical data, where real-world populations can be analyzed and approximated relative to their nearest equilibrium neighbors.

We summarize some biological examples where the abstract framework can be used, extending techniques currently available in the literature. The abstract framework applies universally both to concrete models and empirical data, but it cannot provide biological insights in the absence of models or data. Nonetheless in applications, the Laws of Natural Selection will manifest as constraints on observed selective and environmental growth.

Population niches which are stable over generations can be modeled locally by processes in selective or environmental equilibrium. In the absence of environmental effects, populations engage in pure selective growth, with non-equilibrium populations obtaining faster rates of selection. When combined with environmental effects, populations can interact to optimize

their selective growth via dispersal and mixing, with non-equilibrium populations having a bigger impact for or against selection.

**Example 1.1** (Biological Examples).

- (1) Differentiated individuals on a smooth spacetime, such as predator-prey models in continuous geographical ecosystems [ZFG13] or general evolutionary games [FS16]. Differential calculus and differential games [Isa99] can be used to study dynamics in these environments, especially for loss/gain functions that populations are optimizing against. The Price framework extends the discrete Page-Nowak dynamic framework [PN02] to the case of populations with very small allele differences, as well as arbitrarily large, multi-scale populations.
- (2) Non-differentiated entities on a continuous spacetime, such as plants, fungi, and molds, as illustrated by Fox [Fox06] to study biodiversity loss in a partitioned spatial environment. The abstract framework provides a way to integrate microscopic and macroscopic flora into a single model, as described as shapes extended over a continuous spacetime, organized by genotypic and phenotypic properties. The Price equation describes selective growth of these flora, and the environmental change from dispersion and mixing after spora leave the originating parent. This provides a quantitative framework for the qualitative work of Hamilton and Lenton [HL98], who showed how microbes of the atmosphere (spora) use dispersion and mixing to drive selective growth in their populations, and Lenton and Oijen [LvO02], who provided a simple probabilistic model for discrete daisy populations.
- (3) Stochastically-varying populations, incorporating empirical position, stochastic fluctuations, random strategies, and uncertain states of nature into one distribution describing the system [FP00, Gra02, TWAM20]. This is because statistical models are parametrized distributions [McC02], and models can be integrated using copulas, as is done in the ecological literature [CFS07, GSH<sup>+</sup>20]. The abstract framework extends Rice's stochastic Price equation [Ric08], enabling the multi-level Price equation to simultaneously describe stochasticity and selection at multiple scales.
- (4) Hierarchical bioinformatics like protein folding, which combines microscopic genetic codes in amino-acid sequences, mesoscopic configurations of protein as atom configurations, and macroscopic effects arising from protein interactions [JEP<sup>+</sup>21, Supplementary Material]. Rice [Ric20] shows how to use the stochastic Price equation to analyze bioinformatic codes like genetic sequences, and Reiskind et al. [RMB<sup>+</sup>21] use the Price equation to predict selective changes of genetic frequencies. The abstract framework allows us to integrate Rice and Reiskind et al.'s coding theory with Fox's shape-based analysis [Fox06] for a more complete model of protein folding. Here, entities consist simultaneously of strands of DNA along with folded protein configurations in 3-dimensional space. Transition mappings consist of substitutions of DNA bases, snippings of DNA strands, and reconfigurations and interactions of proteins.
- (5) Approximations of large-population systems by continuous models and hydrodynamic limits, where increasing sequences of finite populations are embedded in a uniform topological space where limits are defined, and transition mappings satisfy partial differential equations [DP06]. Hydrodynamic limits have been historically applied in physics [Rez91], economics [Sca06], and political science [dH08], and more recently have been used in neuroscience to describe large systems of interacting neurons [DMGLP15], and in crowd dynamics to understand behaviors of herds [BHT20].

Week et al. [WNHK21, (10)] present a limiting Price equation to approximate large populations with purely selective growth, which holds under sufficiently strong regularity conditions as the population size goes to infinity. The abstract framework is robust enough to handle infinite population sizes as the limit of large populations, and we present a continuous-time Price equation (8.6) which generalizes that of Week et al. Equilibrium conditions can be analyzed by taking partial derivatives of model parameters, as with the comparative-statics method in political science [LTL15]. In large-but-finite models, decision-making can be analyzed using Poisson games [SBdML17].

- (6) Computer vision, where entities are represented at a microscopic scale as shaded pixels, while simultaneously organized as macroscopic shapes and objects [Sam89, VC20]. This can be represented hierarchically, where population individuals combine pixelated images and collections of features on those images. Transition functions can include changes in the image size and coloration, as well as the addition, subtraction, and merging of object structures. The abstract framework provides a practical way to integrate high-dimensional empirical data of ecosystems with classic evolutionary models that use the discrete Price equation. Nowozin [Now14] analyzes optimal decision-making problems in computer vision, by leveraging Rice’s stochastic Price equation to approximate ratios of random variables [Ric08].
- (7) The Price equation provides an alternate approach to thermodynamics, as illustrated in recent work in the evolutionary biology and statistical physics literature. Nicholson et al. [NGPdCG20, (1)] and Frank and Bruggeman [FB20] identify the discrete Price equation as the equation of motion for systems with finitely-many energy states. They interpret the Price equation as a stochastic First Law of Thermodynamics, decomposing motion into “flux of heat” (selective change) and “flux of work” (environmental change). Nicholson et al. [NGPdCG20, (13)] and Frank [Fra18, §6.4, 12] explore inequalities for the rate of Shannon entropy production, representing stochastic versions of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. These methods directly extend to the general situation via the abstract framework.

Our Laws of Natural Selection are related to the Laws of Thermodynamics in subtle ways, which should be further explored by future researchers. When fitness and population are used to model energy and mass, then our First Law describes a non-conservative version of the First Law of Thermodynamics. Our Second Law shows that selective entropy is monotone under selective change, relating to the monotonicity of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Our Third Law provides extremes for environmental change, and therefore environmental equilibrium corresponds to a “zero temperature” case.

**1.3. Review of Discrete Price Equation.** We recall Price’s discrete work [Pri70, Pri72a] and express it in modern probability formalism. We summarize the general measure-theoretic and quantum frameworks in Section 1.4, and present in detail in Sections 2 and 9.

Let  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_K)$  be a finite set, and let  $\mu = (N_1, \dots, N_K)$  and  $\mu' = (N'_1, \dots, N'_K)$  be two finite measures on  $I$ , representing separate populations of interest (i.e.,  $N_k = \mu(\{i_k\})$  and  $N'_k = \mu'(\{i_k\})$ ). Write the total population sizes  $\mu(I) = N$  and  $\mu'(I) = N'$ . Let  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_K)$  be a measurable function (an “observable”), with average values  $\bar{X} := \mathbb{E}[X] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_k X_k N_k$  and  $\bar{X}' := \mathbb{E}'[X] := \frac{1}{N'} \sum_k X_k N'_k$ .

Price [Pri70] introduced the average change operator as the difference of the average values:

$$\Delta(\bar{X}) := \bar{X}' - \bar{X} = \mathbb{E}'[X] - \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_k X_k (N'_k - N_k). \quad (1.1)$$

Price took as given that the populations  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  be somehow related. We formalize this with the concept of an evolutionary process, representing a full accounting of the child population  $\mu'$  in terms of the parent population  $\mu$ . For the discrete setting, we express an evolutionary process as an arbitrary transition kernel  $w(i, i')$ , satisfying

$$\mu'(i') = \sum_k w(i_k, i') N_k. \quad (1.2)$$

i.e., the second population can be decomposed as a weighted sum against the first population. This is a discrete disintegration equation, in the sense of regular conditional probabilities [LJFR04, Bog07, LaG13]. The kernel  $w$  represents an *evolutionary process*, where  $w(i, i')$  is the contribution of type  $i$  toward child  $i'$ , and equation (1.2) ensures that all children are accounted for in terms of parents. For example, in sexually-reproductive populations, every child has two biological parents, so  $w(i, i') = 1/2$  for each parent  $i$  of  $i'$ . In asexually-reproductive populations, every child  $i'$  has a unique parent  $i$ , so  $w(i, i') = 1$ .

Write the total fitness function  $W_k := W(i_k) := \sum_{k'} w(i_k, i_{k'})$ , i.e., the total contribution to all children  $i_{k'}$  from parent  $i_k$ . Let  $\bar{W} := \frac{N'}{N}$  be the population ratio, satisfying  $\bar{W} = \mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_k W_k N_k$ . Define the relative fitness  $U_k := U(i_k) := \frac{W(i_k)}{\bar{W}}$ .

Price defined the selective change of  $X$  as the covariance against relative fitness:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) := \text{cov}(X, U) := \mathbb{E}[(X - \bar{X})(U - 1)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k (X_k - \bar{X})(U_k - 1) N_k. \quad (1.3)$$

Define the local average  $\langle X \rangle_w(i_k) := \frac{1}{W(i_k)} \sum_{k'} X(i_{k'}) w(i_k, i_{k'}) N_k$ , i.e., the average of  $X$  across all children of  $i_k$ , normalized by fitness. Using this, we can express the process definition (1.2) in terms of a tower property:

$$\mathbb{E}'[X] = \mathbb{E}[U \langle X \rangle_w]. \quad (1.4)$$

i.e., the expected future value is given by taking the scaled population average of the local average weighted by relative fitness. Define the local change  $\Delta_w(X)(i) := \langle X \rangle_w(i) - X(i)$  as the difference between the local average and the original value of  $X$ .

Price defined the environmental change of  $X$  as the average local change, weighted by  $U$ :

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(X) := \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X)U] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle X \rangle_w - X)U] = \mathbb{E}'[X] - \mathbb{E}[UX]. \quad (1.5)$$

The Price equation states that the average change is the sum of selective change and environmental change, with no additional components:

$$\Delta(\bar{X}) = \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(X) = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X)U]. \quad (1.6)$$

The proof of the discrete Price equation is simple given the definitions and tower property:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\bar{X}) &= -\mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}'[X] = (\mathbb{E}[UX] - \mathbb{E}[X]) + (\mathbb{E}[U \langle X \rangle_w] - \mathbb{E}[UX]) \\ &= \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X)U]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

Fisher's fundamental theorem [Pri72a] states that the selective change of relative fitness is equal to its variance:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{cov}(U, U) = \text{var}(U). \quad (1.8)$$

1.4. **Article Summary.** We now summarize our results and contributions.

*Part 1 (Price Equation).* In Section 2, we introduce the abstract framework for the Price equation. We represent populations by finite measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  on some (possibly distinct) measurable spaces  $I$  and  $I'$ , and evolutionary processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  as a measurable linear map of those measures, i.e., as any measurably-varying family of measures  $w_i$  satisfying the disintegration equation

$$\mu'(B) = \int_I w_i(B) \mu(di). \quad (1.9)$$

This includes Price's discrete framework as a special case, while allowing for infinitary changes and evolution of the state space. This includes the biological settings of Sections 1.1 and 1.2 as special cases.

In Section 2, we consider evolutionary processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  satisfying the disintegration equation (2.2), transforming one population measure  $\mu$  of size  $N = \mu(I)$  to another measure  $\mu'$  of size  $N' = \mu'(I')$  via a transition mapping  $w_i$ . Write expectations on functionals by dividing by population sizes:  $\mathbb{E}[X] := \frac{1}{N} \int_I X(i) \mu(di)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X'] := \frac{1}{N'} \int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'(di')$ .

Define the average change  $\Delta(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) := \mathbb{E}[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X]$ . We state and prove the general form of the Price equation (Theorem 2.4):

$$\Delta(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y), \quad (1.10)$$

for the selective and environmental changes:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) := \text{cov}(X, U) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) := \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_w - X] U, \quad (1.11)$$

where  $\text{cov}(X, U) = \mathbb{E}[X(U-1)] = \int_I X(i)(U(i)-1) \mu(di)$  and  $\langle Y \rangle_w(i) := \frac{1}{W(i)} \int_{I'} Y(i') w_i(di')$ .

The general form of Fisher's fundamental theorem (Theorem 2.8) follows as a trivial consequence:  $\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{cov}(U, U) = \text{var}(U)$ . If  $w$  and  $w'$  are composable processes with relative fitnesses  $U$  and  $U'$ , then since both have unit mean ( $\mathbb{E}[U] = 1 = \mathbb{E}[U']$ ), the Price equation implies that the environmental change of relative fitness is non-positive:

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle U' \rangle_w - U] U = \partial_{\text{EC}}(U, U') = -\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = -\text{var}(U) \leq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1 \leq 0, \quad (1.12)$$

for the childbearing population proportion  $p_* := \frac{1}{N} \mu(W > 0)$

In Section 3, we introduce selective equilibrium as the case of life-or-death processes where  $U$  takes exactly two values (0 and  $\frac{1}{p_*}$ ). We prove the ‘‘Weak Zeroth Law of Natural Selection’’ (Proposition 3.2):

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{p_*} \geq 0. \quad (1.13)$$

The first inequality is saturated when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium. The second inequality is saturated when  $w$  is purely environmental: there is no selection or growth, and the process is just a Markov chain. Accordingly, natural selection by itself never reduces average relative fitness, though environmental change might change or eliminate it entirely.

In Section 4, we present ‘‘pure’’ processes, which are fully described by either purely selective or purely environmental change. We prove the Price representation theorem (Theorem 4.4), which states that every evolutionary process factors into a purely selective process followed by a purely environmental one, i.e.,  $w = w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}}$ .

In Section 5, we analyze changes of the variance using Jensen’s inequality. By Fisher’s theorem, the selective change of variance is the “selective acceleration” of relative fitness:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) := \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) := \text{cov}(U^2 - 1, U) = \text{cov}(U^2, U). \quad (1.14)$$

We prove the “First Law of Natural Selection” (Theorem 5.3), showing that selective acceleration is non-negative:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) = \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) \geq \text{var}(U) (1 + \text{var}(U)) \geq 0, \quad (1.15)$$

Just as with the Zeroth Law (1.13), the first inequality of (1.15) is saturated when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium, and the second inequality is saturated when  $w$  is purely environmental.

In Section 6, we provide a lower bound on the environmental change of variance:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U^2, (U')^2)U] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} \mathbb{E}[U^2 (\langle U' \rangle_w - U)] \mathbb{E}[U^2 (\langle U' \rangle_w + U)], \end{aligned} \quad (1.16)$$

which is saturated when the processes are “strongly stationary”, i.e.,  $U'(i') = U(i)$  for  $w_i$ -almost every  $i'$  and  $\mu$ -almost every  $i$ . The change of variance is given by the Price equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}'(U') - \text{var}(U) &= \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) \\ &\geq \text{var}(U) (1 + \text{var}(U)) + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} \mathbb{E}[U^2 (\langle U' \rangle_w - U)] \mathbb{E}[U^2 (\langle U' \rangle_w + U)]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

In Section 7, we prove a general version of Price’s multi-level equation [Pri72b], which he used to describe group selection. In Section 8, we prove a smooth Price equation, extending Price’s continuous-time equation [Pri72b], describing change on smooth spaces.

In Section 9, we present quantum versions of the Price equation, extending to the case of non-commutative observables. We define a unique fitness observable, which is used for distinct left and right quantum Price equations. The degree of non-commutativity measures the quantumness of the process. We prove quantum versions of the Zeroth and First Laws.

In Section 10, we present a version of the Kerr-Godfrey-Smith equation for open processes, as well as open quantum processes. The presence of orphaned children adds a third term to the Price equation: the covariance against the proportion of orphaned children, or equivalently, the negative covariance against the proportion of parented children.

*Part 2 (Selective Entropy).* We introduce the selective entropy to quantitatively measure the effects of selection in a process. In Section 11, we define selective entropy as the Kullback-Leibler divergence (relative entropy) of the relative fitness function:

$$S_{\text{NS}} := \mathbb{E}[-U \log U] \leq 0. \quad (1.18)$$

Selective entropy is non-positive, with saturation exactly when  $w$  is purely environmental. Selective entropy is the amount of information generated by selection across an evolutionary process, and can be thought of as the “negentropy” of Schrödinger [Sch44]. The negated exponential  $\exp(-S_{\text{NS}}) \geq 1$  represents the amount of “selective diversity” in a population, in accordance with the contemporary literature on entropy and diversity [Lei21]. That is, the more values that the relative fitness  $U$  takes, the higher the diversity  $\exp(-S_{\text{NS}})$  will be.

In Theorem 11.4, we prove the strong Gibbs bounds

$$-\log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log p_* \leq 0, \quad (1.19)$$

where  $p_* := \mu(U > 0)/N$  is the proportion of childbearing individuals. The non-trivial inequalities of (1.19) are saturated when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium (i.e.,  $U = 0$  or  $1/p_*$

almost surely). In which case, we have  $-\log(1 + \text{var}(U)) = S_{\text{NS}} = \log p_*$ , or equivalently  $\text{var}(U) = e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1 = \frac{1}{p_*}$ . This implies a strong version of the Zeroth Law (Corollary 11.5):

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U) \geq e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1 \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1, \quad (1.20)$$

with saturation in the selective equilibrium case.

In Section 12, we prove the ‘‘Second Law of Natural Selection’’ (Theorem 12.3), which states that selective entropy can never increase solely under the effect of selection:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) \log \frac{1}{p_*} \leq 0. \quad (1.21)$$

These inequalities all vanish when  $w$  is purely environmental. The non-trivial inequalities are saturated exactly when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium. Consequently, selective-equilibrium processes minimize selective effects, whereas non-equilibrium processes evolves selectively at a faster rate. Thus the effects of selection tend to compound exponentially over time.

We prove a selective speed limit (Theorem 12.5), providing a bound for how fast selection can compound. We also provide bounds on the selective acceleration (Theorem 12.7).

In Section 13, we bound the environmental change of selective entropy (Theorem 13.1):

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) \leq \mathbb{E}[U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3]. \quad (1.22)$$

This is saturated in the strongly stationary case ( $U' = U$  jointly a.s.).

Thus using the Price equation and combining (1.21) and (1.22), we bound total change in selective entropy solely in terms of elementary functionals of the original process:

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{\text{NS}} - S_{\text{NS}} &= \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) \\ &\leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) + \log \mathbb{E}[U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.23)$$

In Section 14, we state the multi-level change of selective entropy, and prove a corresponding Multi-Level Second Law (Theorem 14.2).

In Section 15, we define selective entropy using the spectral theorem and the relative-fitness operator. We prove a Quantum Second Law of Natural Selection, namely that the quantum selective change of quantum selective entropy is non-positive.

*Part 3 (Environmental Entropy).* We introduce the environmental entropy to characterize the degree of environmental change in a process. In Section 16, we prove basic properties about environmental entropy. Write  $U_{A,B}(i) := \frac{1}{N} 1_A(i) w_i(B)$  for each  $i$ , and write  $\overline{U}_{A,B} := \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}] = \frac{1}{N'} \int_A w_i(B) \mu(di)$ . We define environmental entropy as follows:

$$S_{\text{EC}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} (-\mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}] \log \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]) \geq 0. \quad (1.24)$$

where the supremum is over all countable, measurable partitions of  $I$  and  $I'$ , and the sum is over partition sets. This is a one-step version of Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy. The classical KS entropy can be recovered by iterating a process indefinitely, and taking the supremum across all partition refinements over all iterates (Definition 16.8). The exponential  $\exp(S_{\text{EC}}) \geq 1$  represents the amount of ‘‘environmental diversity’’ in a population, i.e., the more distinct values of  $U_{A,B}$  there, the greater  $\exp(S_{\text{EC}})$  is.

We prove a general version of Sinai’s theorem (Theorem 16.4) showing that the supremum in (1.24) must be realized at a “generating joint partition”  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This allows us to define the change of environmental entropy by evaluating the change at joint partition sets.

The total entropy is the sum of the selective and environmental entropies, and can be positive or negative depending on the contribution of physical and biological forces:

$$S_{\text{tot}} := S_{\text{NS}} + S_{\text{EC}} = \mathbb{E}[-U \log U] + \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} (-\mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}] \log \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]). \quad (1.25)$$

In Section 17, we decompose environmental entropy into dispersive and mixing entropy functionals. We define the *dispersive entropy* as

$$S_{\text{dis}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E} \left[ -U_{A,B} \log \frac{U_{A,B}}{U} \right] \geq 0, \quad (1.26)$$

which measures the “inefficiency”, “splitting”, “stretching”, or “clonal replication” of a system. We introduce *mixing entropy* as

$$S_{\text{mix}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{U}_{A,B} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{U_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B} U} \log \frac{U_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B} U} \right] \geq 0 \quad (1.27)$$

where  $\bar{U}_{A,B} := \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]$  is the averaged local relative fitness. Mixing entropy measures the “inconsistency”, “combining”, “folding”, or “sexual reproduction” of a system. The quantities  $\exp(S_{\text{dis}}) \geq 1$  and  $\exp(S_{\text{mix}}) \geq 1$  represent the dispersive and mixing diversities of a population, respectively. The higher  $\exp(S_{\text{dis}})$  and  $\exp(S_{\text{mix}})$  are, the more ways the populations disperse and mix, respectively.

We extend Sinai’s theorem (Theorem 17.6) to show that the dispersive and mixing entropies are maximized exactly at a generating joint partition. Consequently, environmental entropy decomposes as the sum of dispersion and mixing entropies:

$$S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}}. \quad (1.28)$$

In Section 17.3, we present examples based on classical Bernoulli random variables. The dispersive Bernoulli process sends one input to two outputs, and is inefficient and consistent ( $S_{\text{dis}} > 0$ ,  $S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ ). The mixing Bernoulli process sends two inputs to one output, and is efficient and inconsistent ( $S_{\text{dis}} = 0$ ,  $S_{\text{mix}} > 0$ ).

In Section 18, we show that the dispersive and mixing entropies characterize obstructions to invertibility. The Efficiency Theorem (Theorem 18.1) shows that a purely environmental process is left-invertible if and only if it is purely mixing ( $S_{\text{dis}} = 0$ ). The Consistency Theorem (Theorem 18.2) shows that it is right-invertible if and only if it is purely dispersive ( $S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ ). This implies the Reversibility Theorem (Theorem 18.3): a purely environmental process is invertible if and only if environmental entropy vanishes ( $S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ ). Equivalently, the Irreversibility Theorem (Theorem 18.4) shows a purely environmental process is not invertible if and only if it exhibits dispersive or mixing effects (or both). This implies a weak form of Dollo’s law of irreversibility (Corollary 18.6): a full process is invertible if and only if it is purely childbearing ( $p_* = 1$ ) and environmentally reversible ( $S_{\text{EC}} = 0$ ).

In Section 19, we introduce environmental equilibrium and prove bounds on dispersion and mixing entropies. We also present examples of equilibrium and non-equilibrium processes.

In Section 20, we analyze the change of the environmental entropy. The “Weak Third Law of Natural Selection” (Theorem 20.1) shows that environmental-equilibrium processes are characterized by vanishing selective change of environmental, dispersion, and mixing

entropies. The “Strong Third Law” (Theorem 20.4) provides quantitative bounds on selective changes for non-equilibrium processes, and these bounds collapse in the equilibrium case.

In Section 21, we state the Price equation for the environmental entropy. In Section 22, we state the multilevel Price equation for environmental entropy. In Section 23, we define the quantum environmental entropy. In Section 24, we conclude the article.

We hope that this work adds clarity to the mathematical biology and physics literatures, and provides a formal grounding for a unified theory of evolution and thermodynamics in the future. McCullagh reminds us that “mathematics knows nothing about anything except mathematics, so mathematics must be instructed in the facts of rural life” [McC02, p. 1304]. We call on other scientists to use this abstract framework in the spirit of Price and Hamilton, gleaming new insights to altruistically help populations of the world.

**Acknowledgements.** T.L. gives particular thanks to Elliot Aguilar, who first introduced him to the Price equation and encouraged him to put it on a more general foundation.

T.L. also thanks Erin Beckman, Michael Betancourt, Tyler Bryson, Miguel Carrión Álvarez, David Cesarini, Dorian Goldman, Brendan Fong, George Hagstrom, Bryan , Joseph Hirsh, Taylor Kessinger, Angela Linneman, Kellen Olszewski, Benjamin Pittman-Polletta, Javier Rodríguez Laguna, Lisa Rogers, Leila Vaez-Azizi, Brad Weir, and Janek Wehr for helpful discussions on the Price equation.

T.L. was supported by NSF PIRE Grant No. OISE-07-30136 while at the Courant Institute (NYU) in 2010-2013, and is grateful to Adam Brandenberger, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Samantha Kappagoda, Bud Mishra, David Mordecai, Charles Newman, Alastair Smith, Daniel Stein, and Lai-Sang Young for mentorship during those years.

T.L. finalized the work during free time while at Splunk, and is now at Google. T.L. certifies that there is no actual or potential conflict of interest in relation to this article.

## 2. THE GENERAL PRICE EQUATION AND FISHER’S FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM

In this section, we introduce the evolutionary process framework, and prove general versions of Price’s equation and Fisher’s fundamental theorem. We model population states by (finite) measures, and we model processes by transition mappings between states.

Formally, let  $(I, \mathcal{I})$  be a measurable space (a set  $I$  and a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{I}$ ), representing a “type space” for describing a population. A point  $i \in I$  represents a discrete, individual “type”, and a measurable subset  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  represents a more complex type or group of types. A population state (or “data”) is modeled by a measure  $\mu$  on  $I$ , where the value  $\mu(A)$  represents the number of individuals of type  $A$ . The total population size is given by  $N := \mu(I)$ . A population variable (or observable) is a measurable function  $X : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and the integral  $\mu[X] := \int_I X(i) \mu(di)$  represents the aggregate sum of the variable across the population. The average value is given by normalizing by population size:  $\bar{X} := \mathbb{E}[X] := \frac{1}{N} \mu[X]$ .

Let  $\mu'$  be another population state of interest, defined on a (possibly different) measurable space  $(I', \mathcal{I}')$ . This framework supports both the cases of distinct and overlapping type spaces. If there is overlap, we write  $I_\cap := I \cap I'$ . Most authors including Price consider the case  $I = I'$ , but we separate the initial and final spaces for clarity and generality. Let  $N' := \mu'(I')$  be the total population size, and for any measurable function  $Y$  on  $I'$ , we define  $\mu'[Y] := \int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'(di')$  and  $\bar{Y} := \mathbb{E}[Y] := \frac{1}{N'} \mu'[Y]$ .

There are multiple ways to compare the population states  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ , even if there is no overlap of types. Fisher [Fis30] recognized that the key quantity is the *selective coefficient*, defined as the ratio of population sizes:  $\overline{W} := \frac{N'}{N}$ .

For any measurable  $X$  and  $Y$ , define the average change as the difference of averages:

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) := \overline{Y} - \overline{X} = \mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X]. \quad (2.1)$$

When  $Y = X$ , we write  $\Delta(\overline{X}) := \Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{X})$ .

We define an *evolutionary process* as a complete accounting of the second population state in terms of the first, and we write  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  for this transition mapping. We formalize this as a disintegration [LJFR04, Bog07, LaG13], applied to the case of finite measures.

**Definition 2.1** (Evolutionary Process). We say that a measure-valued function  $w : i \mapsto w_i$  is a (regular) *evolutionary process* if is a disintegration mapping  $\mu$  to  $\mu'$ , i.e.,

- (1) For all  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ,  $i \mapsto w_i(B)$  is a measurable function of  $i \in I$ .
- (2) For all measurable  $B \subseteq I'$ , the disintegration equation holds:

$$\mu'(B) = \int_I w_i(B) \mu(di). \quad (2.2)$$

The disintegration equation (2.2) is equivalent to the following, for any integrable  $Y$ :

$$\int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'(di') = \int_I \int_{I'} Y(i') w_i(di') \mu(di). \quad (2.3)$$

It is convenient to treat  $\mu$  as the “parent” population and  $\mu'$  as the “child” population, with  $w_i$  representing the distribution of children for parent  $i$ . We define the *fitness function* to be the total number of children:

$$W(i) := w_i(I'). \quad (2.4)$$

The fitness function is itself a measurable observable, and the average fitness equals the selective coefficient, i.e., the relative population sizes:  $\mathbb{E}[W] = \overline{W} = \frac{N'}{N}$ . To see this, compute  $\mathbb{E}[W] = \frac{1}{N} \int_I W(i) \mu(di) = \frac{1}{N} \int_I w_i(I') \mu(di) = \frac{1}{N} \mu'(I') = \frac{N'}{N}$ . We write  $U(i) := W(i)/\overline{W}$  for the relative fitness function.

**Remark 2.2.** The definition of an evolutionary process is a purely phenomenological assumption. We make no causal, correlative or dynamical assumptions of the populations, nor do we make any assumptions on evolution away from the states  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ . We merely begin with the assumption that there is *some* accounting function  $w$ , and we examine the deductive consequences of this assumption. This can be helpful in empirical analysis, to validate or falsify the assumption of a process  $w$  characterizing the relationship between two states  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  (e.g., a genealogy or other causal relationship), but the possibility of other processes should not be overlooked.

We say that two processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$  are *composable* when they share the same intermediate process. In that case, we write

$$(w' \circ w)_i(C) := \int_{I''} \int_{I'} w'_{i'}(C) w_i(di'), \quad (2.5)$$

for any measurable  $C$  and any  $i \in I$ .

We say that a process  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is *generally reversible* if it is measurably invertible, i.e., there exists another evolutionary process  $w^{-1} : \mu' \mapsto \mu$  such that the compositions are

the identity processes (i.e.,  $w^{-1} \circ w = 1_\mu$  and  $w \circ w^{-1} = 1_{\mu'}$ ). We characterize the class of environmentally reversible processes in Section 18 via vanishing environmental entropy functionals.

**2.1. Natural Selection.** To state and prove the Price equation, we decompose the process  $w$  into selective and environmental components. Price [Pri70] (echoing Fisher [Fis30] before him) recognized that selective change can be described as population covariance against relative fitness  $U := W/\bar{W}$ .

Formally, let  $\text{cov}$  denote the population covariance for the probability measure  $\mu/N$ . i.e., if  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are two measurable functions on  $I$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(X_1, X_2) &:= \mathbb{E}[(X_1 - \bar{X}_1)(X_2 - \bar{X}_2)] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \int \left( X_1(i) - \frac{1}{N} \int X(i_1) \mu(di_1) \right) \left( X_2(i) - \frac{1}{N} \int X_2(i_2) \mu(di_2) \right) \mu(di). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

We say that an evolutionary process  $w$  is “finite-mean” if the fitness is finite mean ( $\mathbb{E}[W] = \bar{W} < \infty$ , and “finite-variance” if the fitness is finite variance ( $\text{var}(W) := \text{cov}(W, W) < \infty$ ). Since the populations are finite, finite-variance implies finite-mean. The class of finite-variance processes is the class for which the selective change is well defined:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) := \text{cov}(X, U) := \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])(U - 1)] = \mathbb{E}[X(U - 1)]. \quad (2.7)$$

where the simplification follows from elementary algebra. To see this, compute  $\text{cov}(X, \frac{W}{\bar{W}}) = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])(\frac{W}{\bar{W}} - 1)] = \mathbb{E}[X \frac{W}{\bar{W}}] - \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[1] - \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[\frac{W}{\bar{W}}] + \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[1] = \mathbb{E}[X \frac{W}{\bar{W}}] - \mathbb{E}[X]$ , since  $\mathbb{E}[\frac{W}{\bar{W}}] = 1$ . Price identified this as one half of the total change, formulated in the Price equation (2.16).

Fisher’s form of his fundamental theorem follows as a trivial consequence of this definition:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{cov}(U, U) = \text{var}(U). \quad (2.8)$$

The selective change encodes the correlative relationship between a trait and fitness. No causal claim is made: high values of the trait could cause high fitness, or high fitness could cause high values of the trait, or some third factor could be a cause of high values of both. The causal network between various traits and fitness is complex, and the effects of these pathways is a major subject in modern biology. See [Gre09] for a recent introduction to natural selection. Price’s views on selection can be found in [Pri71b].

**Remark 2.3** (Classical Regression Statistics). Natural selection represents an “internal” covariance, where positive correlations between observed traits  $X$  and relative fitness  $U = \frac{W}{\bar{W}}$  are “recorded” by the population. Fisher [Fis30] abstracted away the recording details, and summarized the relationships with population statistics. Write the standard deviations  $\sigma_X := \sqrt{\text{var}(X)}$  and  $\sigma_W := \sqrt{\text{var}(W)}$ , regression coefficients  $\beta_{X,W} := \text{cov}(X, W) / \text{var}(W)$ , and correlation coefficients  $\rho_{X,W} := \text{cov}(X, W) / (\sigma_X \sigma_W)$ . The selective change equals:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) = \frac{\text{cov}(X, W)}{\bar{W}} = \frac{\beta_{X,W} \text{var}(W)}{\bar{W}} = \frac{\rho_{X,W} \sigma_X \sigma_W}{\bar{W}}, \quad (2.9)$$

**2.2. Environmental Change.** Price [Pri70] introduced the environmental change component to fully capture the effects of non-selective change. We present a formalism for working with environmental change, based on conditional expectations from probability.

First, we introduce the “local average” operator, defined by integrating over the child population, and normalizing by fitness:

$$\langle Y \rangle_w(i) := \frac{1}{W(i)} \int Y(i') w_i(di'). \quad (2.10)$$

For each  $Y$ ,  $i \mapsto \langle Y \rangle_w(i)$  is a measurable observable. For each  $i$ ,  $Y \mapsto \langle Y \rangle_w(i)$  is a probability expectation operator. When the context is clear, we drop the subscript  $w$  and write  $\langle Y \rangle := \langle Y \rangle_w$ . The fundamental relation is the tower property,

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] = \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_w], \quad (2.11)$$

adapting the tower property of conditional expectations to variable-size measures. To prove (2.11), compute

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] = \frac{1}{N'} \int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'(di') = \frac{1}{N'} \int_I \int_{I'} Y(i') w_i(di') \mu(di) = \frac{1}{N} \int_I \frac{W(i)}{\overline{W}} \langle Y \rangle_w(i) \mu(di) = \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_w]. \quad (2.12)$$

This allows us to compare  $\mathbb{E}'[Y] = \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_w]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X]$  on a common measure space  $(I, \mu)$ .

We use this to define the “local change” operator, by subtracting the original value of  $X$  from the local average:

$$\Delta_w(X, Y)(i) := \langle Y \rangle_w(i) - X(i) = \frac{1}{W(i)} \int_I Y(i') w_i(di') - X(i). \quad (2.13)$$

The local change  $\Delta_w(X, Y)(i)$  is a function of  $i$  (and depends on  $w$ ), whereas the average change  $\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  is a single value (and does not depend on  $w$ ). The local change measures the difference of average value  $\langle Y \rangle_w(i)$  from the original value  $X(i)$ . If  $Y = X$ , we write  $\Delta_w(X) := \Delta_w(X, X)$ .

We define the environmental change by weighting the local change by relative fitness, and averaging across the parent population:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) := \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle Y \rangle_w - X)U]. \quad (2.14)$$

The environmental change is the second half of the Price equation (2.16).

Identity (2.11) lets us rewrite the environmental change as follows:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_w - UX] = \mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[UX]. \quad (2.15)$$

**2.3. Price Equation.** The Price equation follows as an immediate consequence. This extends the discrete Price equation to the case of general finite measures (with no topological constraints), as well as separate functions  $X$  and  $Y$ .

**Theorem 2.4** (General Price Equation). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are measurable functions on  $I$  and  $I'$ , respectively, then the Price equation holds:

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U]. \quad (2.16)$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to (1.7). Using the definition (2.7) and the tower property (2.11), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) &= -\mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}'[Y] = (\mathbb{E}[UX] - \mathbb{E}[X]) + (\mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_w] - \mathbb{E}[UX]) \\ &= \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

□

It can be useful to write various aggregate forms of the Price equation, rather than averaged. We state this as the following corollary. The aggregate Price equation includes similar terms to (2.16) with relative fitness replaced by absolute fitness, plus an additional term.

**Corollary 2.5** (Aggregate Price Equation). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are measurable functions on  $I$  and  $I'$ , respectively, then the aggregate Price equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I'} Y \mu' - \int_I X \mu &= N' \mathbb{E}'[Y] - N \mathbb{E}[X] \\ &= N' \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) + N' \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) + (N' - N) \mathbb{E}[X] \\ &= N \text{cov}(X, W) + N \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)W] + (N' - N) \mathbb{E}[X] \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

$$= \int_I (X(W - \overline{W}) + \Delta_w(X, Y)W + (\overline{W} - 1)X) \mu \quad (2.19)$$

$$= \int_I (X(W - 1) + \Delta_w(X, Y)W) \mu. \quad (2.20)$$

We can analyze the evolution of population measures using the Price equation.

**Corollary 2.6** (Evolution of Population Measures). Let  $w$  be finite variance. Then for any measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}'[1_B] - \mathbb{E}[1_A] = \text{cov}(1_A, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(1_A, 1_B)U] \quad (2.21)$$

$$\mu'(B) - \mu(A) = N \text{cov}(1_A, W) + N \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(1_A, 1_B)W] + (N' - N) \mathbb{E}[1_A]. \quad (2.22)$$

*Proof.* Apply the standard and aggregate Price equations with  $X = 1_A$  and  $Y = 1_B$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.7** (Locally Finite Case). If  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  are locally-finite measures satisfying a disintegration equation (2.2), then the non-covariant aggregate Price equation (2.20) still holds. This can be verified directly:  $\int_{I'} Y \mu' - \int_I X \mu = \int_I (X(W - 1) + (\langle Y \rangle_w - X)W) \mu$ , for  $XW \in L^1(\mu)$ . Thus much of this article can be adapted to the locally-finite case.

**2.4. Fisher's Fundamental Theorem.** Fisher's fundamental theorem (2.8) states that selective change of relative fitness is equal to the variance of relative fitness:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{cov}(U, U) = \text{var}(U). \quad (2.23)$$

The aggregate version states that selective change of fitness is proportional to its variance:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(W) = \text{cov}(W, U) = \frac{\text{var}(W)}{\overline{W}}. \quad (2.24)$$

The general version incorporates the environmental change to analyze the change of the fitness functions across time.

Consider three measures  $\mu$ ,  $\mu'$  and  $\mu''$  on measurable spaces  $I$ ,  $I'$  and  $I''$ , with population sizes  $N$ ,  $N'$  and  $N''$ , respectively. Consider two composable processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ . Define the fitness functions  $W(i) := w_i(I')$  and  $W(i') := w'_{i'}(I'')$ , with selective coefficients  $\overline{W} := N'/N$  and  $\overline{W}' := N''/N'$ . Define the relative fitness functions  $U := W/\overline{W}$  and  $U' := W'/\overline{W}'$ .

By construction,  $U$  and  $U'$  both have unit mean ( $\mathbb{E}[U] = 1 = \mathbb{E}'[U']$ ). When we apply the Price equation, the left side vanishes and so environmental change equals negative variance.

**Theorem 2.8** (Generalized Fisher’s Fundamental Theorem). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes, with  $w$  finite-variance. Then:

$$0 = \Delta(\bar{U}, \bar{U}') = \partial_{\text{NS}}(U) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(U, U') = \text{var}(U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U, U')U]. \quad (2.25)$$

Equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U, U')U] = -\text{var}(U). \quad (2.26)$$

*Proof.* This follows from the Price equation, setting  $X := U$  and  $Y := U'$ .  $\square$

When we apply this to the full fitness functions, we have:

$$\bar{W}' - \bar{W} = \partial_{\text{NS}}(W) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(W, W') = \frac{\text{var}(W)}{\bar{W}} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(W, W')W]}{\bar{W}}. \quad (2.27)$$

### 3. SELECTIVE EQUILIBRIUM AND THE ZEROth LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION

We introduce selective equilibrium to understand the extreme case of “minimally selective” processes. Selective equilibrium is the extreme case where all selection is due to life and death and no other population variance. The Weak Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2) states that variance is minimized in the case of selective equilibrium. In Section 11, we state and prove a Strong Zeroth Law, improving upon the lower bound using selective entropy.

**Definition 3.1** (Selective Equilibrium). We say that a process  $w$  is “in selective equilibrium” if  $W$  takes exactly two values: 0 and a single positive value  $\bar{U}_* := 1/p_*$ , where  $p_* := \frac{1}{N}\mu(U > 0)$  is the proportion of childbearing population.

Define the childbearing population  $\mu_*(A) := \mu(A \cap \{U > 0\})$  and expectation operator  $\mathbb{E}_*[X] := \frac{1}{p_*}\mathbb{E}[1_{U>0}X]$ . The measures  $\mu_*$  and  $U\mu$  are mutually absolutely continuous. i.e.,  $\mu_*(A) = 0$  if and only if  $(U\mu)(A) := \int_A U(i)\mu(di) = 0$ .

**Proposition 3.2** (Weak Zeroth Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U) \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1, \quad (3.1)$$

with saturation exactly when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium (in which case,  $\text{var}(U) = \frac{1}{p_*} - 1$ ).

*Proof.* We write the variance as:

$$\text{var}(U) = \mathbb{E}[(U - 1)^2] = (1 - p_*) + p_*\mathbb{E}_*[(U - 1)^2]. \quad (3.2)$$

We now apply Jensen’s inequality to the second term, since  $\mathbb{E}_*$  is a probability expectation and  $(x - 1)^2$  is convex, and we rearrange:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(U) &\geq (1 - p_*) + p_*(\mathbb{E}_*[U] - 1)^2 = (1 - p_*) + p_*\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right)^2 \\ &= (1 - p_*) + (1 - p_*)\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) = \frac{1}{p_*} - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

since  $\mathbb{E}_*[U] = \frac{1}{p_*}\mathbb{E}[U] = \frac{1}{p_*}$ . Saturation of this inequality occurs exactly when  $U$  is constant  $\mu_*$ -almost surely, i.e., the selective-equilibrium case.  $\square$

Using the general version of Fisher’s theorem (2.25), this implies an upper bound on the environmental change of relative fitness.

**Corollary 3.3.** Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes, with  $w$  finite-variance. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(U, U') = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U, U')U] = -\text{var}(U) \leq -\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right), \quad (3.4)$$

with saturation when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium.

#### 4. "PURE" PROCESSES AND THE PRICE REPRESENTATION THEOREM

We consider the extreme cases of purely selective and purely environmental processes. We show that purely selective processes correspond to absolutely continuous measures, and purely environmental processes correspond to Markov chains. We then prove a novel representation theorem (Theorem 4.4), showing that every evolutionary process can be written as the composition of a purely selective process followed by a purely environmental process.

**Definition 4.1** (Pure Processes).

- (1) (Purely Selective) Consider measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  defined on the same space. We say that a process  $w$  is *purely selective* if the average change of an observable is fully described by selective change:  $\Delta(\bar{X}, \bar{X}) = \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) = \text{cov}(X, U)$ . Equivalently, environmental change vanishes ( $\partial_{\text{EC}}(X, X) = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, X)U] = 0$ ).
- (2) (Purely Environmental) Consider measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  on (possibly different) spaces  $I$  and  $I'$ . We say that  $w$  is *purely environmental* if its average change between observable  $X$  and  $Y$  is fully described by environmental change:  $\Delta(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U]$ . Equivalently, selective change vanishes ( $\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) = \text{cov}(X, U) = 0$ ).

**Theorem 4.2** (Characterization of Pure Processes).

- (1) (Purely Selective iff Absolute Continuity) Consider measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  on the same space. A process  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is purely selective if and only if  $\mu'$  is absolutely continuous to  $\mu$  ( $\mu' \ll \mu$ ) with Radon-Nikodym density equal to fitness ( $\frac{d\mu'}{d\mu} = W$  a.s.).
- (2) (Purely Environmental iff Markov Chain) Consider measures on possibly distinct spaces  $I$  and  $I'$ . A process  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is purely environmental if and only if the fitness function  $W$  and relative fitness  $U$  are almost surely constant (with  $W = \overline{W}$  and  $U = 1$  a.s.). In this case,  $w$  is a Markov chain with transition kernel  $w_i(di')$ , with uniform scaling by  $\overline{W}$ .

*Proof.* Proof of (1). Suppose that  $w$  is purely selective, so  $0 = \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, X) = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X)U]$  for each  $X$ . Thus  $\mathbb{E}'[X] = \mathbb{E}[XU]$  for every  $X$ . Hence  $\mu'/N'$  (resp.  $\mu'$ ) is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu/N$  (resp.  $\mu$ ), with density  $U$  (resp.  $W$ ).

We show that absolutely continuous measures define a purely selective process. Suppose that  $\mu' \ll \mu$  with Radon-Nikodym density  $W := \frac{d\mu'}{d\mu}$ . Define the purely selective  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  by weighting with the density function  $W$ , i.e.,  $w_i(A) := W(i)\delta_i(A)$ , where  $\delta_i(A)$  is the Dirac point-mass concentrated on  $i$ . i.e.,  $\delta_i(A) = 1$  if  $i \in A$ , and  $= 0$  if  $i \notin A$ . Then  $\mu'(A) = \int_A W(i)\mu(di) = \int_{I'} w_i(A)\mu(di)$ , proving (1).

Proof of (2). Suppose  $w$  is purely environmental, so  $0 = \text{cov}(X, U) = \mathbb{E}[X(U - 1)]$  for all  $X$ . Since this holds for all  $X$ , we must have that  $U = 1$  a.s. (hence  $W = \overline{W}$ ). This is a standard functional argument. Let  $H(\mu) = \{X : \text{var}(X) < \infty\}$  denote the Hilbert space of finite-variance observables, equipped with the covariance inner product. Since  $H$  is closed, if  $\text{cov}(X, U) = 0$  for all  $X$ , then  $\text{var}(U) = 0$ , hence  $U$  is constant a.s. and equal to  $\mathbb{E}[U] = 1$ .

Consequently,  $W = \overline{W}$  a.s. Conversely, suppose  $W$  is a.s. constant (with  $W = \overline{W}$ ). Then  $\partial_{\text{NS}}(X) = \text{cov}(X, \frac{W}{\overline{W}}) = 0$  since  $W = \overline{W}$  almost everywhere. Thus  $w$  is purely environmental.

If  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is a Markov process between two probability distributions with kernel  $w_i(\text{d}i')$ , then it describes a purely environmental process since  $W(i) := w_i(I') = 1$  is the conditional probability of  $I'$  given  $i$ . Conversely, if  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is purely environmental, then  $N' = N$  and  $w_i(I') = 1$ , so  $w$  is a regular conditional probability hence a one-step Markov chain.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** If one measure is absolutely continuous with respect to another ( $\mu' \ll \mu$ ), there exists a unique purely selective process  $w^{\text{NS}} : \mu \rightarrow \mu'$ , given by the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $W := \frac{\text{d}\mu'}{\text{d}\mu}(i)$ , but there can also exist purely environmental or general processes between these measures. For example, suppose that  $\mu$  assigns mass 1/2 to each of  $\{0\}$  and  $\{1\}$ , and  $\mu'$  assigns mass 1 to  $\{0\}$ . Then  $\mu' \ll \mu$  with  $W^{\text{NS}}(0) := \frac{\text{d}\mu'}{\text{d}\mu}(0) = 2$  and  $W^{\text{NS}}(1) := \frac{\text{d}\mu'}{\text{d}\mu}(1) = 0$ . There also exists a Markov chain  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  with  $w_0(0) = 1$ ,  $w_1(0) = 1$ , and  $W(0) = 1 = W(1)$ .

The Price equation is equivalent to the following representation theorem, decomposing any process as a selective process  $w_{\text{NS}}$  followed by an environmental one  $w_{\text{EC}}$ .

**Theorem 4.4** (Price Representation Theorem). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process with fitness  $W$ . Define the purely selective process  $w_{\text{NS}} : \mu \mapsto W\mu$  and the purely environmental process  $w_{\text{EC}} : W\mu \mapsto \mu'$  as follows:

$$w_{\text{NS},i}(\tilde{\text{d}}i) := W(\tilde{i})\delta_i(\tilde{\text{d}}i) \quad \text{and} \quad w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}}(\text{d}i') := \frac{w_{\tilde{i}}(\text{d}i')}{W(\tilde{i})}, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\delta_i$  is the Dirac point-mass measure on  $I$ . Then

$$w = w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}}. \quad (4.2)$$

The selective changes of  $w$  and  $w_{\text{NS}}$  are equal:

$$\partial_{w,\text{NS}}(X) = \text{cov}(X, U) = \partial_{w_{\text{NS}},\text{NS}}(X); \quad (4.3)$$

and the environmental changes of  $w$  and  $w_{\text{EC}}$  are equal:

$$\partial_{w,\text{EC}}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\Delta_{w_{\text{EC}}}(X, Y)] = \partial_{w_{\text{EC}},\text{EC}}(X, Y), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y] := \mathbb{E}[UY]$ .

*Proof.* Using Theorem 4.2, we have that  $w_{\text{NS}}$  is purely selective, since it is absolutely continuous to  $\mu$  with density equal to the fitness function; and  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is purely environmental, since  $w_{\text{EC},i}(I') = \frac{w_i(I')}{W(i)} = 1$  for all  $i$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}})_i(\text{d}i') &= \int w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}}(\text{d}i') w_{\text{NS},i}(\tilde{\text{d}}i) = \int \frac{w_{\tilde{i}}(\text{d}i')}{W(\tilde{i})} W(\tilde{i}) \delta_i(\tilde{\text{d}}i) \\ &= \frac{w_i(\text{d}i')}{W(i)} W(i) = w_i(\text{d}i'), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\delta_i(\tilde{\text{d}}i)$  is the Dirac delta distribution on  $I$ . i.e.,  $\delta_i(A) = 1$  if  $i \in A$  and  $= 0$  if  $i \notin A$ . Clearly, the selective changes are equal, since both  $w$  and  $w_{\text{NS}}$  have fitness function  $W$  on population  $\mu$ .

Define the intermediate population  $\tilde{\mu} := W\mu$  on  $I$  (i.e.,  $\tilde{\mu}(A) := \int_A W(i)\mu(di)$ ), and intermediate expectation  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y] := \mathbb{E}[UY]$ . Note that  $\tilde{\mu}$  has population size  $N'$ . We compute the adaptive local change

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{w_{\text{EC}}}(X, Y)(\tilde{i}) &:= \langle X' \rangle_{w_{\text{EC}}}(\tilde{i}) - X(\tilde{i}) = \int \frac{X'}{W(\tilde{i})} w_{\tilde{i}}(di') - X(\tilde{i}) \\ &= \langle X' \rangle_w(\tilde{i}) - X(\tilde{i}) = \Delta_w(X, Y)(\tilde{i})\end{aligned}\quad (4.6)$$

Averaging with  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{w_{\text{EC}}, \text{EC}}(X, Y) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\Delta_{w_{\text{EC}}}(X, Y)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{\text{EC}}(X, Y)U] = \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y).\end{aligned}\quad (4.7)$$

□

**Remark 4.5** (Reversibility). We say that  $w$  is selectively reversible when  $w_{\text{NS}}$  is invertible. This holds if and only if  $p_* = 1$ , in which case  $w_{\text{NS}}^{-1}$  is given by multiplication by the reciprocal fitness  $\frac{1}{W}$ . We may always recover the childbearing population by multiplying by  $\frac{1}{W}$ :  $\mu_* = \frac{1}{W}\tilde{\mu}$ . We say that  $w$  is environmentally reversible when  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is invertible, and analyze that case in Section 18.

As an immediate consequence, we can decompose any composition  $w' \circ w$  as a single selective piece followed by a purely environmental one. If  $X$  is  $I$ -measurable and  $Y$  is  $\mu'$ -integrable, define the composable product  $(Y \circ X)(i) := \langle Y \rangle_w(i)X(i)$ .

**Corollary 4.6.** Let  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$  be two composable processes. Define the composed fitness function

$$W^{(2)}(i) := (W' \circ W)(i) := \int_{I'} W'(i')w_i(di') = \langle W' \rangle_w(i)W(i), \quad (4.8)$$

and define the purely selective process by multiplying by  $W^{(2)}$ :

$$(w' \circ w)_{\text{NS}, i}(A) := W^{(2)}(i)\delta_i(A), \quad (4.9)$$

where  $\delta_i$  is the Dirac delta function on  $i$ . Define the purely environmental process

$$(w' \circ w)_{\text{EC}, i}(C) := \frac{(w' \circ w)_i(C)}{(W' \circ W)(i)} = \frac{1}{W^{(2)}(i)} \int_{I'} w'_{i'}(C)w_i(di'). \quad (4.10)$$

for measurable  $C \subseteq I''$ . Then the composed process equals:

$$w' \circ w = (w' \circ w)_{\text{EC}} \circ (w' \circ w)_{\text{NS}}. \quad (4.11)$$

The composed process has fitness function  $W^{(2)} = W' \circ W = \langle W' \rangle_w W$ , and relative fitness function  $U^{(2)} := U' \circ U := \langle U' \rangle_w U = W' \circ W / (\overline{W'} \overline{W})$ .

**4.1. Application to Matrix Theory.** The Price representation theorem admits a simple form in terms of matrices. Consider Price's context of discrete evolutionary processes, as in Section 1.3. Finite discrete populations are encoded by finite-dimensional vectors  $\mu, \mu'$ , and an evolutionary process as a finite-dimensional matrix  $w = (w(i, i'))$ , with  $\mu' = w\mu$ . These vector spaces are equipped with the  $L^1$  norm, so  $N = |\mu| = \sum_{i=1}^K \mu_i$  and  $N' = |\mu'| = \sum_{i'=1}^{K'} \mu'_{i'}$ . The discrete Price representation theorem is equivalent to the matrix identity

$$w = w_{\text{EC}} w_{\text{NS}}, \quad (4.12)$$

where  $w_{\text{NS}}$  is a diagonal matrix, and  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is a right stochastic (Markov transition) matrix.

## 5. SELECTIVE CHANGE OF VARIANCE AND THE FIRST LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION

We state a functional form of the Price equation, and we use this to analyze selective change of relative-fitness variance. We prove a First Law of Natural Selection, showing that  $\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) \geq \text{var}(U) (1 + \text{var}(U)) \geq 0$ , with saturation of the first inequality in the selective-equilibrium case.

**Corollary 5.1** (Functional Price Equation). Let  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  denote an evolutionary process. Let  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  be vector-valued observables, and let  $F(\mathbf{X})$  and  $G(\mathbf{Y})$  be integrable functionals. Formally, we assume that  $X : I \rightarrow V$  and  $Y' : I' \rightarrow V'$  are Borel-measurable functions to topological vector spaces  $V, V'$ , and that  $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : V' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are Borel-measurable real-valued functions. Define the selective functional change  $\partial_{\text{NS}} F(\mathbf{X}) := \text{cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), U)$  and the environmental functional change  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(F(\mathbf{X}), G(\mathbf{Y})) := \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(f(\mathbf{X}), g(\mathbf{Y}))U]$ . The functional Price equation holds:

$$\Delta(F(\mathbf{X}), G(\mathbf{Y})) = \partial_{\text{NS}} F(\mathbf{X}) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(F(\mathbf{X}), G(\mathbf{Y})) = \text{cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(f(\mathbf{X}), g(\mathbf{Y}))U]. \quad (5.1)$$

**5.1. Functional Change of Variance.** We now analyze the change of variance across generations. Let  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$  be composable processes, with fitness functions  $W$  and  $W'$  and relative fitnesses  $U = W/\mathbb{E}[W]$  and  $U' = W'/\mathbb{E}[W]$ . Write the two variance functionals as  $\text{var}(U) = \mathbb{E}[U^2 - 1]$  and  $\text{var}'(U') = \mathbb{E}'[(U')^2 - 1]$ . We write the difference of variances as follows:

$$\Delta(\text{var}(U)) := \Delta(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) := \text{var}'(U') - \text{var}(U) = \mathbb{E}'[(U')^2] - \mathbb{E}[U^2]. \quad (5.2)$$

Fisher's theorem states that selective velocity is given by relative-fitness variance:  $\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U)$ . We define the selective change of variance, or selective acceleration, by

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) := \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) := \text{cov}(U^2, U) = \mathbb{E}[U^2(U - 1)], \quad (5.3)$$

and environmental change of variance

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) := \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U^2, (U')^2)U] = \mathbb{E}[\langle (U')^2 \rangle_w - U^2] U. \quad (5.4)$$

The functional Price equation ensures that the change of variance decomposes as the sum of the selective and environmental changes:

$$\text{var}'(U') - \text{var}(U) = \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')). \quad (5.5)$$

The aggregate difference of variances follows from the vector form of the functional Price equation (since  $\text{var}(W) = \mathbb{E}[(W - \bar{W})^2] = \mathbb{E}[f(X, \bar{X})]$ ). Consequently:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}'(W') - \text{var}(W) &= \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(W) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(W), \text{var}'(W')) \\ &= \text{cov}((W - \bar{W})^2, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w((W - \bar{W})^2, (W' - \bar{W}')^2)U]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

**5.2. First Law of Natural Selection.** Recall that the Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2) states that  $\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U) \geq 0$ . This is a monotonically upward trend for relative-fitness under the effect selection, and shows that selection acts in the direction of never decreasing relative fitness, though the effect of the environment can be arbitrary.

We strengthen this result, and show that there is a non-negative lower bound on the selective acceleration, compounding effects of selection upon itself. We prove weak and strong versions, saturated in the purely environmental and selective-equilibrium cases, respectively.

**Proposition 5.2** (Weak First Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  have finite third moment  $\mathbb{E}[U^3] < \infty$ . The selective change of relative fitness variance is non-negative:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\text{NS}}(U)^2 \geq 0. \quad (5.7)$$

Both inequalities are saturated exactly when  $w$  is purely environmental (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) = \frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\text{NS}}(U)^2 = 0$ ), otherwise the inequalities are strict.

*Proof.* The bound for  $\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U)$  uses Jensen's inequality for the quadratic term:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) &= 2 \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(U+1)(U-1)^2] \geq 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(U+1)U] - 1 \right)^2 \\ &= 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} (\text{var}(U) + 2) - 1 \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

since  $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[U+1] = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}[(U+1)U] = \mathbb{E}[U^2] + \mathbb{E}[U] = \text{var}(U) + 2$ . This is saturated when  $U+1$  is constant  $\mu$ -a.s., i.e.,  $U+1 = \bar{U} + 1 = 2$ , the purely environmental case.  $\square$

We strengthen this result by applying Jensen's inequality to the child-bearing population.

**Theorem 5.3** (Strong First Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  have finite third moment  $\mathbb{E}[U^3] < \infty$ . Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) = \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) \geq \partial_{\text{NS}}(U) (1 + \partial_{\text{NS}}(U)) \quad (5.9)$$

$$= \text{var}(U) (1 + \text{var}(U)) = \text{var}(U) \mathbb{E}[U^2] \geq 0, \quad (5.10)$$

with saturation of the first inequality exactly when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium. In that case,  $\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) = \frac{1}{p_*} (\frac{1}{p_*} - 1) = \frac{1}{p_*^2} - \frac{1}{p_*}$ .

*Proof.* We change measure to the intermediate population and rewrite the covariance:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) = \text{cov}(U^2, U) = \mathbb{E}[(U^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^2])(U - 1)] = \mathbb{E}[(U^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^2])U] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U^2] - \mathbb{E}[U^2]. \quad (5.11)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[X] = \mathbb{E}[UX]$ . Using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U^2] - \mathbb{E}[U^2] = \mathbb{E}[U^2]^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^2] = \mathbb{E}[U^2] (\mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1), \quad (5.12)$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U] = \mathbb{E}[U^2] = 1 + \text{var}(U)$ , proving (5.9). This inequality is saturated exactly when  $U$  is constant  $U\mu$ -a.s.. Since  $U\mu$  is mutually absolutely continuous with  $\mu_*$ , saturation is equivalent to  $U$  being constant  $\mu_*$ -a.s., i.e.,  $w$  is in selective equilibrium.  $\square$

We use the same technique to analyze higher-order selective derivatives of relative fitness, and the exponential of relative fitness. The Higher-Order First Law shows that all these selective changes are non-negative, meaning that selection acts monotonically upon all scales of fitness.

**Proposition 5.4** (Higher-Order First Law). Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[U^{n+1}] < \infty$  for  $n \geq 1$ . The higher-order selective changes are non-negative:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^n(U) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p_*^{n-1}} (\text{var}(U) + 1 - p_*)^n \geq 0, & n \text{ even,} \\ \frac{1}{p_*^n} (1 - p_*)^{n+1} \geq 0, & n \text{ odd,} \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

with saturation of the left inequality when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium.

Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[e^U] < \infty$ . The selective change of the exponential  $e^U$  is non-negative:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(e^U) = \text{cov}(e^U, U) \geq (1 - p_*) (e^{1/p_*} - 1) \geq 0, \quad (5.14)$$

with saturation of the first inequality when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium.

*Proof.* In the even case,  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^n(U) = \partial_{\text{NS}}^{n-1}(\text{var}(U)) = p_* \mathbb{E}_*[U(U-1)^n] \geq p_*(\mathbb{E}_*[U^2] - 1)^n = p_*\left(\frac{1}{p_*}\mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1\right)^n = \frac{1}{p_*^{n-1}}(\text{var}(U) + 1 - p_*)^n$ . In the odd case,  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^n(U) = \partial_{\text{NS}}^{n-1}(\text{var}(U)) = p_* \mathbb{E}_*[(U-1)^{n+1}] \geq p_*(\mathbb{E}_*[U] - 1)^{n+1} = \frac{1}{p_*}(1 - p_*)^{n+1}$ . For (5.14), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}}(e^U) &= \text{cov}(e^U, U) = \mathbb{E}[(U-1)e^U] = \mathbb{E}[Ue^U] - \mathbb{E}[e^U] \\ &= p_* \mathbb{E}_*[U \exp(U)] + p_* \mathbb{E}_*[-\exp(U)] - (1 - p_*) \\ &\geq p_* \mathbb{E}_*[U] \exp(\mathbb{E}_*[U]) - p_* \exp(\mathbb{E}_*[U]) - 1 + p_* \\ &= e^{1/p_*} - p_* e^{1/p_*} - 1 + p_* = (1 - p_*) (e^{1/p_*} - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

□

**Corollary 5.5** (Aggregate First Law). Let  $w$  have finite third moment. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 W \geq \overline{W} \text{var}(U) (1 + \text{var}(U)) = \frac{1}{\overline{W}^3} \text{var}(W) \left( \overline{W}^2 + \text{var}(W) \right). \quad (5.16)$$

*Proof.* Fisher's theorem states  $\partial_{\text{NS}} W = \frac{\text{var}(W)}{\overline{W}}$ . Thus aggregate selective acceleration equals:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(W) := \partial_{\text{NS}} \partial_{\text{NS}} W = \text{cov}\left(\frac{(W - \overline{W})^2}{\overline{W}}, \frac{W}{\overline{W}}\right) = \overline{W} \text{cov}((U-1)^2, U) = \overline{W} \partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U). \quad (5.17)$$

Inequality (5.16) follows from the First Law. □

## 6. ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE OF VARIANCE

We rearrange the environmental change of variance with intergenerational fitness ratios, then prove a lower bound, which is saturated in a certain stationarity case.

**Definition 6.1** (Intergenerational Fitness Ratios). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be finite-mean. For  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$  and  $w_i$ -a.e.  $i'$ , define the intergenerational relative fitness as the ratio of relative fitnesses:

$$R := R(i, i') := \frac{U'(i')}{U(i)}, \quad (6.1)$$

which need not be defined when  $U(i) = 0$ . Define the averaged intergenerational relative fitness as the average value of  $R(i, i')$  across the children of  $i$ . That is, for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$ , define:

$$\overline{R}_w := \overline{R}_w(i) := \langle R \rangle_w(i) = \frac{\langle U' \rangle_w(i)}{U(i)}. \quad (6.2)$$

**Definition 6.2** (Stationarity of Joint Processes). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable. Then:

- (1) The pair  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary if  $R(i, i') = 1$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$  and  $w_i$ -a.e.  $i'$ , i.e.,  $U'(i') = U(i)$  for  $w_i$ -a.e. child of  $i$ .
- (2) The pair  $(w, w')$  is weakly stationary if  $\overline{R}_w(i) = 1$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$ , i.e., the average relative fitness among children of  $i$  equals  $U(i)$ .
- (3) The pair  $(w, w')$  is locally homogeneous if  $R$  is constant jointly-a.s.. That is, there exists a constant  $\lambda$  so that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$  and  $w_i$ -a.e.  $i'$ ,  $R(i, i') = \lambda$  (so  $U'(i') = \lambda U(i)$ ).
- (4) The pair  $(w, w')$  is locally constant if  $U'$  is  $w_i$ -a.s. constant for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$ . That is, for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $i$ ,  $U'(i') = \langle U' \rangle_w(i)$  for  $w_i$ -a.e.  $i'$ .

Strong stationarity is equivalent to being both weakly stationary and locally homogeneous. Proof: If  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary, then  $R$  is constant jointly-a.s. and equal to 1, so  $\overline{R}_w$  is constant a.s. and equal to 1. Conversely, if  $R = \lambda$  jointly-a.s. and  $\overline{R}_w = 1$  a.s., then  $\overline{R}_w = \langle R \rangle_w = \langle \lambda \rangle_w = \lambda$  a.s. We relate the joint stationarity conditions to marginal environmental conditions.

**Lemma 6.3.**

- (1) The joint process  $(w, w')$  is weakly stationary if and only if  $w$  is purely environmental and  $\langle U' \rangle_w = 1$   $\mu$ -a.s.
- (2) The joint process  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary if and only if both  $w$  and  $w'$  are purely environmental.

*Proof.* Suppose  $(w, w')$  is weakly stationary, so  $\overline{R}_w = 1$   $\mu$ -a.s. Thus:

$$\text{var}(U) = \mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1 = \mathbb{E}[U^2 \overline{R}_w] - 1 = \mathbb{E}'[U'] - 1 = 0. \quad (6.3)$$

Thus  $U$  is a.s. constant, so  $w$  is purely environmental ( $U = 1$  a.s.), and  $\langle U' \rangle_w = \overline{R}_w U = 1$  almost surely. Conversely, if  $U = 1$  a.s. and  $\langle U' \rangle_w = 1$  a.s., then  $\overline{R}_w = 1$  a.s.

If  $w$  and  $w'$  are both purely environmental, then  $U' = 1 = U$ , hence strongly stationary. Conversely, if  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary, then  $w$  is purely environmental (since strong implies weak stationarity), so  $U' = U = 1$  a.s. So both  $w$  and  $w'$  are purely environmental.  $\square$

We prove a strong lower bound for the environmental change of variance.

**Proposition 6.4** (Strong Lower Bound for  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U'))$ ). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable finite-variance processes. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) \geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} \mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w - 1)] \mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w + 1)], \quad (6.4)$$

which is saturated in the strongly stationary case (in which case,  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) = 0$ ).

*Proof.* We use Jensen's inequality twice. First, observe that  $\langle R^2 \rangle_w(i) \geq \overline{R}_w^2(i)$  for each  $i$ , since the function  $R \mapsto R^2$  is convex and  $\langle \cdot \rangle_w$  is a probability expectation for each  $i$ . Second,  $\overline{R}_w \mapsto \overline{R}_w^2$  is convex and  $\mathbb{E}$  is a probability expectation, so we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{EC}}(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) &= \mathbb{E}[U^3(\langle R^2 \rangle_w - 1)] \geq \mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w^2 - 1)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[U^3] \left( \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^3 \overline{R}_w]}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} \right)^2 - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} (\mathbb{E}[U^3 \overline{R}_w]^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^3]^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} (\mathbb{E}[U^3 \overline{R}_w] - \mathbb{E}[U^3])(\mathbb{E}[U^3 \overline{R}_w] + \mathbb{E}[U^3]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]} \mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w - 1)] \mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w + 1)]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

The first inequality is saturated when  $R$  is constant  $\mu'$ -almost surely for a.e.  $i$ , i.e., when  $w$  is locally homogeneous. The second inequality is saturated when  $\overline{R}_w$  is constant  $\mu$ -almost surely, i.e., when  $w$  is weakly stationary. Since strong stationarity implies weak stationarity, both inequalities are saturated exactly in the strongly stationary case.  $\square$

By combining Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 6.4 via the Price equation, we have the following lower bound on the average change.

**Corollary 6.5.** Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes with  $w$  finite-variance. Then:

$$\Delta(\text{var}(U), \text{var}'(U')) \geq \text{var}(U)(1 + \text{var}(U)) + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^3]}(\mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w - 1)])(\mathbb{E}[U^3(\overline{R}_w + 1)]), \quad (6.6)$$

with saturation when  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary. Strong stationarity implies purely environmental, hence selective equilibrium.

## 7. MULTI-LEVEL PRICE EQUATION

We present the general form of Price's multi-level equation [Pri72b] which is useful in applications. Our version of the multi-level Price equation relaxes the assumption of additivity, and enables a hierarchical decomposition for any composed process. Additivity arises from measures being linear objects, and admitting a linear disintegration into different scales. No other additivity assumptions are required.

Consider the case of composable processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ , with fitness functions  $W(i) := w_i(I')$  and  $W'(i') := w'_i(I'')$ , selective coefficients  $\overline{W} := \mathbb{E}[W] = \frac{N'}{N}$  and  $\overline{W}' := \mathbb{E}[W'] = \frac{N''}{N'}$ , and relative fitnesses  $U := \frac{W}{\overline{W}}$  and  $U' := \frac{W'}{\overline{W}'}$ .

Define the composed process  $w^{(2)} := w' \circ w : \mu \mapsto \mu''$  by  $w_i^{(2)}(C) := \int_{I'} w'_i(C) w_i(\text{d}i')$ , and the composed fitness function

$$W^{(2)}(i) := \langle W' \rangle_w(i) W(i) = \int_{I'} W'(i') w_i(\text{d}i'), \quad (7.1)$$

with selective coefficient  $\overline{W}^{(2)} := \mathbb{E}[W^{(2)}] = \frac{N''}{N}$  and relative fitness  $U^{(2)} := \frac{W^{(2)}}{\overline{W}^{(2)}} = \langle U' \rangle_w U$ .

Consider observables  $X, Y$ , and  $Z$  on  $I, I'$ , and  $I''$ , respectively. The individual Price equation gives us the following for the processes  $w, w'$ , and  $w^{(2)}$ :

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U] =: \partial_{\text{NS}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}(X, Y) \quad (7.2)$$

$$\Delta(\overline{Y}, \overline{Z}) = \text{cov}'(Y, U') + \mathbb{E}'[\Delta_{w'}(Y, Z)U'] =: \partial'_{\text{NS}}(Y) + \partial'_{\text{EC}}(Y, Z) \quad (7.3)$$

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Z}) = \text{cov}(X, U^{(2)}) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{w^{(2)}}(X, Z)U^{(2)}] =: \partial_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}^{(2)}(X, Z) \quad (7.4)$$

The hierarchical Price equation allows us to decompose the composed selective and environmental changes in terms of those of the first process, and a conditioning of the second process with a certain ‘‘drift’’ term.

Write  $\mathbb{E}'_w[Y](i) := \langle Y \rangle(i)U(i)$  for the conditional expectation (satisfying the tower property  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[Y]] = \mathbb{E}'[Y]$ ), and  $\text{cov}'_w(Y, Y')(i) := \mathbb{E}'_w[YY'](i) - \mathbb{E}'_w[Y](i)\mathbb{E}'_w[Y'](i)$  for the conditional covariance (satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}'_w(Y, Y')] = \text{cov}(Y, Y') + \mathbb{E}'[Y]\mathbb{E}'[Y'] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[Y]\mathbb{E}'_w[Y']]$ ). We have:

$$\mathbb{E}'_w[U'](i) = \langle U' \rangle_w(i)U(i) = U^{(2)}(i) \quad (7.5)$$

**Theorem 7.1** (Multi-Level Price Equation). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes, with  $w^{(2)} := w' \circ w$ . For any observables  $Y$  and  $Z$  on  $I'$  and  $I''$ , respectively, we have the multi-level selective and environmental changes:

$$\partial'_{\text{NS}}(Y) = \text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[Y], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}_w(Y, U')] \quad (7.6)$$

$$\partial'_{\text{EC}}(Y, Z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(Y, Z)U']] \quad (7.7)$$

and the multi-level Price equation:

$$\Delta(\overline{Y}, \overline{Z}) = \text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[Y], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}_w(Y, U') + \mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(Y, Z)U']] \quad (7.8)$$

*Proof.* For the proof of (7.6), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[Y], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}'_w(Y, U')] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[Y]\mathbb{E}'_w[U'] - \mathbb{E}'[Y] + \mathbb{E}'_w[YU'] - \mathbb{E}'_w[Y]\mathbb{E}'_w[U']] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[YU'] - \mathbb{E}'[Y]] = \mathbb{E}'[YU'] - \mathbb{E}'[Y] \\
&= \text{cov}'(Y, U') = \partial'_{\text{NS}}(Y).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

For the proof of (7.7), we compute:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(Y, Z)U']] = \mathbb{E}'[\Delta_w(Y, Z)U'] = \partial'_{\text{EC}}(Y, Z). \tag{7.10}$$

□

**Corollary 7.2** (Composed Multi-Level Price Equation). For any observables  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  on  $I, I'$  and  $I''$ , respectively, we have the composed multi-level Price equation:

$$\Delta(\bar{X}, \bar{Z}) = \text{cov}(X, U) + \text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[Y], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(X, Y)U] + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}'_w(Y, U') + \mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(Y, Z)U']] \tag{7.11}$$

**Corollary 7.3** (Multi-Level Fisher's Theorem). We have the multi-level versions of Fisher's fundamental theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Delta(\bar{U}', \bar{U}'^{(2)}) = \text{var}(\mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U') + \mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(U', U^{(2)})U']], \\
0 &= \Delta(\bar{U}, \bar{U}^{(2)}) = \text{var}(U) + \text{var}(\mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(U, U')U] + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U') + \mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_w(U', U^{(2)})U']]
\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

*Proof.* We set  $X = U, Y = U'$ , and  $Z = U^{(2)} = \langle U' \rangle U = \mathbb{E}'_w[U']$ , and apply the multi-level Price equation. □

**Remark 7.4** (Stochastic Price Equation). Rice [Ric20] interprets the multi-level Price equation in a stochastic framework. Suppose that  $I$  is some statistical parameter space with a distribution  $\mu$ , and let  $w_i$  be a measure on  $I'$  varying measurably in the parameter value  $i \in I$ . Let  $\mu'$  be the measure given by integrating over parameter values  $i$  (i.e.,  $\mu'(B) = \int_I w_i(B)\mu(di)$ ). Consider a process  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ , for some measure  $\mu''$  on  $I''$ . Then Rice's stochastic Price equation [Ric20, (2.2)] is exactly the multi-level Price equation (7.8).

## 8. SMOOTH PRICE EQUATION

We state and prove a general time-varying version of the Price equation, generalizing Price's informal time-varying equation Price [Pri72b, (A 23)]. Page and Nowak [PN02, (4)] stated Price's time-varying equation without precise definition as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbb{E}}(P) = \text{cov}(P, U) + \mathbb{E}(\dot{P}), \tag{8.1}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}$  is a time-varying expectation,  $U$  is a time-varying fitness function, and  $P$  is a time-varying observable. However, this is ambiguous and needs a more precise formalism.

Let  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be an open set representing a time domain, and let  $(I^t, \mathcal{I}^t, \mu^t)$  be a (possibly varying) family of measurable spaces. For each pair  $t \leq t'$  in  $T$ , let  $w^{t,t'} : \mu^t \mapsto \mu^{t'}$  denote a time-varying evolutionary process, i.e., a transition kernel satisfying (2.2) and the temporal consistency condition  $w^{t,t''} = w^{t',t''} \circ w^{t,t'}$  for any  $t, t', t'' \in T$ . Define the time-varying fitness  $W^{t,t'}(i^t) := w_{i^t}(I^{t'})$  and the relative fitness  $U^{t,t'}(i^t) := W^{t,t'}(i^t)/\bar{W}^{t,t'}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X^t)$  be a time-varying finite-variance family of observables, with means  $\bar{X}^t := \mathbb{E}^t[X^t]$ . Define the local-average  $\langle X^{t'} \rangle_w^{t,t'}(i^t) := \frac{1}{W^{t,t'}(i^t)} \int_{I^{t'}} X^{t'}(i^{t'}) w_{i^t}^{t,t'}(di^{t'})$  and local-change  $\Delta_w^{t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})(i^t) := \langle X^{t'} \rangle_w^{t,t'}(i^t) - X^t(i^t)$ .

For any  $t \leq t'$ , the discrete-time Price equation holds:

$$\Delta^{t,t'}(\bar{X}^t, \bar{X}^{t'}) = \text{cov}^t(X^t, U^{t,t'}) + \mathbb{E}^t[\Delta_w^{t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})U^{t,t'}]. \quad (8.2)$$

**Definition 8.1** (Smooth Evolutionary Processes). Consider a time-varying process  $w := (w^{t,t'})$  and a time-varying family of observables  $\mathbf{X} := (X^t)$ . We say that  $w$  is a *smooth evolutionary process* at  $X^t$  if the following hold:

- (1) (Smooth Expectations) The time-varying average is smooth at  $t$ , i.e., the limit of real numbers is well-defined:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}^t}{dt}[X^t] := \lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\Delta^{t,t'}(\bar{X}^t, \bar{X}^{t'})}{|t' - t|} = \lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{t'}[X^{t'}] - \mathbb{E}^t[X^t]}{|t' - t|}. \quad (8.3)$$

- (2) (Relative-Fitness Density) The time-varying relative fitness admits a density at  $t$ , where we take the  $L^2(\mu^t)$ -limit:

$$\Upsilon^t(i) := L^2\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{U^{t,t'}(i)}{|t' - t|}. \quad (8.4)$$

- (3) (Local-Change Density) The time-varying local change admits a density at  $t$ , where we take the  $L^1(\mu^t)$ -limit:

$$\delta^t(\mathbf{X})(i) := L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\Delta_w^{t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})}{|t' - t|} := L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\langle X^{t'} \rangle_w^{t,t'}(i) - X^t(i)}{|t' - t|}. \quad (8.5)$$

The local-change density depends on  $w^{t,t'}$  and  $X^{t'}$  for  $t'$  in an infinitesimal vicinity of  $t$ .

**Theorem 8.2** (Time-Varying Price Equation). Suppose  $w = (w^{t,t'})$  is a smooth process at  $X^t$ . Then the smooth Price equation holds at  $t$ :

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}^t}{dt}[X^t] = \text{cov}^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t) + \mathbb{E}^t[\delta^t(\mathbf{X})]. \quad (8.6)$$

Furthermore, if  $w$  is a process satisfying two of the assumptions of Definition 8.1 at  $t$ , then the third assumption holds, and so  $w$  is smooth at  $t$  and the Price equation (8.6) holds.

*Proof.* We begin with the time-varying Price equation (8.2), and divide both sides by  $|t' - t|$ :

$$\frac{\Delta^{t,t'}(\bar{X}^t, \bar{X}^{t'})}{|t' - t|} = \text{cov}^t\left(X^t, \frac{U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|}\right) + \mathbb{E}^t\left[\frac{\Delta(X^t, X^{t'})U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|}\right]. \quad (8.7)$$

Assuming smooth expectations (8.3), for the left side, when we take  $t' \downarrow t$ , we get  $\frac{d\mathbb{E}^t}{dt}[X^t]$ .

Assuming a relative-fitness density (8.4), for the selective term, we have the  $L^2$ -limit:  $\frac{U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|} \rightarrow \Upsilon^t$  in  $L^2$  as  $t' \downarrow t$ . Since  $\mu^t$  is a finite measure, this implies convergence in covariance, hence for the linear operator  $\cdot \mapsto \text{cov}(X^t, \cdot)$ . This proves  $\text{cov}^t\left(X^t, \frac{U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|}\right) \rightarrow \text{cov}^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t)$

Assuming a local-change density (8.5), for the environmental term, we use the product rule for  $L^1$ -differentiation as  $t' \downarrow t$ :

$$\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \mathbb{E}^t\left[\frac{\Delta_w^{t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|}\right] = \mathbb{E}^t[\delta^t(\mathbf{X})U^{t,t} + \Delta_w^{t,t}(X^t, X^t)\Upsilon^t] = \mathbb{E}^t[\delta^t(\mathbf{X})], \quad (8.8)$$

since  $U^{t,t}(i) = 1$  and  $\Delta_w^{t,t}(X^t, X^t)(i) = 0$  almost surely. Thus (8.6) holds at  $t$ .

If we assume only two assumptions of Definition 8.1, then we use (8.2) to put the two Cauchy sequence terms on one side, ensuring that the remaining term is also a Cauchy

sequence, and the corresponding limits (8.3), (8.4), and (8.5) all exist. This proves the missing assumption, and so  $w$  is smooth.  $\square$

**Conjecture 8.3.** The author conjectures that there exist non-smooth processes satisfying any one of the assumptions of Definition 8.1 without satisfying the other two assumptions. For those processes, the Price equation (8.6) would not hold.

Consider the situation where we have information of a process up to time  $t$ , and wish to understand new infinitesimal evolution happening at time  $t$ . We can apply the multi-level Price equation to each time interval, then take  $t' \downarrow t$ . We follow the notation of the previous section for conditional expectation and covariance.

**Corollary 8.4** (Time-Varying Multi-Level Price Equation). Suppose  $w = (w^{t,t'})$  is a smooth evolutionary process at  $X^t$ . Then for any time-varying family of observables  $X = (X^t)$ , the time-varying, multi-level Price equation holds at  $t$ :

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}^t}{dt}[X](i) = \text{cov}^t(\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[X^t], \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\Upsilon^t]) + \mathbb{E}^t \left[ \text{cov}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t) + \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\Delta_{w^{t,t'}}(X^t, X^{t,t'})U^{t,t'}] \right]. \quad (8.9)$$

*Proof.* For each  $t_0 \leq t \leq t'$ , we apply the discrete multi-level Price equation:

$$\Delta(\bar{X}^t, \bar{X}^{t'}) = \text{cov}^t(\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[X^t], \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[U^{t,t'}]) + \mathbb{E}^t \left[ \text{cov}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t(X^t, U^{t,t'}) + \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\Delta_{w^{t,t'}}(X^t, X^{t,t'})U^{t,t'}] \right]. \quad (8.10)$$

By the bounded convergence theorem, for fixed  $t_0, t$ , when we take  $t' \downarrow t$ , we have  $\text{cov}^t(\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[X^t], \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[U^{t,t'}]) \rightarrow \text{cov}^t(\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[X^t], \mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\Upsilon^t]); \mathbb{E}^t[\text{cov}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t(X^t, U^{t,t'})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^t[\text{cov}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t)];$  and  $\mathbb{E}^t[\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\Delta_{w^{t,t'}}(X^t, X^{t,t'})U^{t,t'}]] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^t[\mathbb{E}_{w^{t_0,t}}^t[\delta^t(\mathbf{X})]]$ . This proves (8.9).  $\square$

## 9. QUANTUM PRICE EQUATION

We present a novel quantum form of the Price equation. Note: our presentation is unrelated to the “quantum evolution” of Simpson [Sim44]. For a brief overview of quantum mechanics in general, see [Tak08, p. 65] or [MPM17].

Let  $H$  and  $H'$  be arbitrary Hilbert spaces (not necessarily separable). Let  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A}(H')$  denote the spaces of observables, i.e., the self-adjoint operators on the Hilbert spaces. Let  $\mu : H \rightarrow H$  and  $\mu' : H' \rightarrow H'$  be trace-class, self-adjoint density operators with non-negative finite traces:  $0 \leq N := \text{Tr} \mu < \infty$  and  $0 \leq N' := \text{Tr}' \mu' < \infty$ . We allow for unbounded observables and unbounded, trace-class density operators. Write  $\bar{W} := \frac{N'}{N}$  for the ratio of population sizes, i.e., the quantum selective coefficient.

The operators  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  represent “mixed states” of quantum populations, and the non-negative real numbers  $N$  and  $N'$  represent the quantum “sizes” of the population. Just as classical evolutionary theory allows for populations of variable size, quantum evolutionary theory allows for quantum populations of variable size, and this variability is what drives quantum selective effects. The case where  $N = 1$  and  $N' \leq 1$  is common in quantum computation, representing [NC02, WPGP<sup>+</sup>12].

Any population operator  $\mu$  defines a measure on its Hilbert space  $H$  via the push forwards of the volume measures:  $\mu_*(\lambda)(E) := \lambda(\mu^{-1}E)$ . Consequently, we can make statements up to  $\mu$ -almost everywhere on  $H$  and  $\mu'$ -almost everywhere on  $H'$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{M}' := \mathcal{M}'(H')$  denote the spaces of density operators. Define the population mean operators by normalizing the trace operators by quantum population sizes:

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[X] := \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] := \frac{1}{N'} \text{Tr}'(Y\mu'). \quad (9.1)$$

Define the average change between observables by

$$\Delta(X, Y) := \mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[X] = \frac{1}{N'} \text{Tr}'(Y\mu') - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X\mu). \quad (9.2)$$

Define the population covariance operator by

$$\text{cov}_\mu(X_0, X_1) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[X_1 X_0] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[X_1] \mathbb{E}_\mu[X_0] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X_1 X_0 \mu) - \frac{1}{N^2} \text{Tr}(X_0 \mu) \text{Tr}(X_1 \mu). \quad (9.3)$$

We define a quantum evolutionary operation to be a measurable linear map which sends the non-negative cone  $\mathcal{M}$  to the non-negative cone  $\mathcal{M}'$ . We do not need quantum operations to be trace-preserving or completely positive.

**Definition 9.1** (Quantum Evolutionary Operator as Quantum Channel). We say that  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$  is a *quantum evolutionary operator* transforming  $\mu$  into  $\mu'$  if the following hold:

- The linear operator  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$  is measurable.
- The child population is fully accounted for by the parent population via the process:

$$\mu' = \mathcal{W}(\mu). \quad (9.4)$$

We say that  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is purely left- (resp. right-) selective if it is given by left- (resp. right) multiplication by a self-adjoint operator (i.e.,  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}(\mu) = W^{\text{left}} \mu$  for some  $W^{\text{left}} \in \mathcal{A}$ , resp.  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}(\mu) = \mu W^{\text{right}}$  for some  $W^{\text{right}} \in \mathcal{A}$ ), and that  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$  is purely environmental if it is trace-preserving.

**Remark 9.2.** Classical quantum channels are the trace-preserving, completely positive maps, which are a subclass of purely environmental maps. Not-completely-positive, trace-preserving operations are still purely environmental, because they preserve trace. Trace-decreasing quantum operations have  $\overline{W} < 1$ , and therefore admit selective effects.

**9.1. Quantum Selective Change.** A quantum evolutionary process admits an adjoint process, which defines a fitness operator.

**Lemma 9.3** (Quantum Adjoint). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a quantum evolutionary operator. There exists an adjoint operator  $\mathcal{W}^\dagger : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  satisfying

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}^\dagger(Y)\mu) = \text{Tr}'(Y\mathcal{W}(\mu)) \quad (9.5)$$

for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ . The adjoint does not depend on  $\mu$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}'$  are topological linear spaces, with dual spaces  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  and dual product given by the trace functionals  $\text{Tr}$  and  $\text{Tr}'$ , the adjoint is well-defined.  $\square$

Define the quantum fitness operator for  $\mathcal{W}$  as the pullback of the identity  $\text{Id}'$  on  $I'$  via the adjoint, and the quantum relative-fitness operator by scaling by the selective coefficient:

$$W := \mathcal{W}^\dagger(\text{Id}') \quad \text{and} \quad U := \frac{1}{\overline{W}} W = \frac{1}{\overline{W}} \mathcal{W}^\dagger(\text{Id}'). \quad (9.6)$$

**Lemma 9.4.** The fitness operator has mean equal to the selective coefficient, and the relative fitness has mean equal to one:

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[W] = \overline{W} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu[U] = 1. \quad (9.7)$$

*Proof.* Using the property of the adjoint, we have  $N\mathbb{E}_\mu[W] = \text{Tr}(W\mu) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}^\dagger(\text{Id}')\mu) = \text{Tr}'(\text{Id}'\mathcal{W}(\mu)) = \text{Tr}'(\mu') = N' = \overline{W}N$ .  $\square$

Define the quantum selection changes  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^{\text{left}}(X) := \text{cov}(X, U)$  and  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^{\text{right}}(X) := \text{cov}(U, X)$ . In general non-commutative settings, these functionals are distinct, and are related by

$$\text{cov}(X, U) = \text{cov}(U, X) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[[X, U]], \quad (9.8)$$

for the commutator  $[X, U] = XU - UX$ . Proof:  $\text{cov}(X, U) = \text{Tr}(XU\mu) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[X]\mathbb{E}_\mu[U] = \text{Tr}(UX\mu) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[U]\mathbb{E}_\mu[X] + \text{Tr}([X, U]\mu) = \text{cov}(U, X) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[[X, U]]$ .

**9.2. Quantum Environmental Change.** We define left and right local-average operators, by pre-composing or post-composing the adjoint operator with the inverse-fitness operator. Formally, for each  $Y \in \mathcal{A}'$ , we define the left local-average  $\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}} \in \mathcal{A}$  on the subspace  $WH$  and the right local-average  $\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}} \in \mathcal{A}$  on the full space  $H$  by:

$$\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}} := (\mathcal{W}^\dagger Y)W^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}} := W^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^\dagger Y). \quad (9.9)$$

Formally, the left and right local-average operators are related by the identity  $\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}W = \mathcal{W}^\dagger Y = W\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}$ , and satisfy the quantum tower property:

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}U] = \mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[U\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}]. \quad (9.10)$$

We define the left and right local-change operators from  $X$  to  $Y$  by:

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y) := \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}} - X \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y) := \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}} - X. \quad (9.11)$$

Define the quantum environmental changes by  $\partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y)U]$  and  $\partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[U\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y)]$ . These are related by:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y) = \frac{1}{\overline{W}}\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\mathcal{W}^\dagger Y) - XW] = \partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[[U, X]]. \quad (9.12)$$

### 9.3. Quantum Price Equations.

**Theorem 9.5** (Quantum Price Equations). For each  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{A}'$ , the left and right quantum Price equations are satisfied:

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \partial_{\text{NS}}^{\text{left}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y) = \partial_{\text{NS}}^{\text{right}}(X) + \partial_{\text{EC}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y), \quad (9.13)$$

that is,

$$\Delta(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \text{cov}_\mu(X, U) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}(X, Y)U] \quad (9.14)$$

$$= \text{cov}_\mu(U, X) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[U\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}(X, Y)]. \quad (9.15)$$

*Proof.* Using the definitions constructed, the proof is trivial by adding and subtracting  $XU$  (resp.  $UX$ ) from the integrand, as with the classical case:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(X, Y) &= \frac{1}{N'} \text{Tr}'(Y\mu') - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X\mu) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(XU\mu - X\mu) + \frac{1}{N'} \text{Tr}(\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}U\mu - XU\mu) \end{aligned} \quad (9.16)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(UX\mu - X\mu) + \frac{1}{N'} \text{Tr}(U\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}\mu - UX\mu) \quad (9.17)$$

which yields (9.14) and (9.15) since  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[U] = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}U] = \mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[U\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}]$ .  $\square$

The quantum version of Fisher's theorem follows.

**Corollary 9.6** (Quantum Fisher's Theorem). Let  $\mathcal{W} : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $\mathcal{W}' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$  be composable quantum evolutionary processes, with relative fitness operators  $U$  and  $U'$ , respectively. Then the quantum form of Fisher's fundamental theorem holds:

$$0 = \Delta(\overline{U}, \overline{U}') = \text{var}(U) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}}(U, U')U] = \text{var}(U) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[U\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}}(U, U')]. \quad (9.18)$$

Applied to the difference of traces, we have:

$$\text{Tr}'(Y\mu') - \text{Tr}(X\mu) = \text{Tr}(X(W-1)\mu) + \text{Tr}((\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left}} - X)W\mu) \quad (9.19)$$

$$= \text{Tr}\left((W-1)X\mu + \text{Tr}(W(\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right}} - X)\mu)\right). \quad (9.20)$$

following the same algebra as the classical case (Corollary 2.5).

**9.4. Quantum Price Representation Theorem.** A quantum Price representation theorem follows. Define the purely selective operation  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  as left-multiplication by  $W$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}(\mu) := W\mu$ ), and the purely environmental operation  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$  by precomposing  $\mathcal{W}$  with inverse fitness (i.e.,  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}(\tilde{\mu}) := \mathcal{W}(W^{-1}\tilde{\mu})$ ).

**Corollary 9.7** (Quantum Price Representation Theorem). The Price decomposition holds:

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}} \circ \mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}. \quad (9.21)$$

The selective (resp. environmental) change of  $\mathcal{W}$  equals that of  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}$ ).

*Proof.* Decomposition (9.21) follows trivially from the definition. The operation  $\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}$  is trace-preserving since  $\text{Tr}'(\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}(\tilde{\mu})) = \text{Tr}'(\mathcal{W}(W^{-1}\tilde{\mu})) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}^\dagger(\text{Id}')W^{-1}\tilde{\mu}) = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mu})$ .

Note that  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}^\dagger(\text{Id})\mu) = \text{Tr}(W\mu)$  hence  $W_{\text{NS}} = W$ . Thus  $\partial_{\mathcal{W}_{\text{NS}}, \text{NS}}(X) = \text{cov}_\mu(X, U) = \partial_{\mathcal{W}, \text{NS}}(X)$ . Note that  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}^\dagger(\text{Id}')W\mu) = \text{Tr}'(\mathcal{W}(W^{-1}W\mu)) = \text{Tr}'(\mu) = \text{Tr}(W\mu)$  hence  $W_{\text{EC}} = \text{Id}$  and so  $\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}} = \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}$ . Thus  $\partial_{\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}, \text{EC}}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}_{W\mu}[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}_{\text{EC}}}(X, Y)\text{Id}] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}(X, Y)U] = \partial_{\mathcal{W}, \text{EC}}(X, Y)$ .  $\square$

**9.5. Quantum Jensen's Inequality.** We present a lower bound for the variance, corresponding to a quantum version of the Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2). First, we need a version of Jensen's inequality for weighted trace functionals which we can apply to the quantum setting. If  $f$  is a real-valued function and  $X$  is a self-adjoint operator, let  $f(X)$  denote the self-adjoint operator defined using the spectral theorem.

**Lemma 9.8** (Quantum Jensen's Inequality). Let  $\mu$  be a finite-trace density operator, with expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[X] := \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X\mu)$ . For any convex function  $f$  and self-adjoint operator  $X$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X)] \geq f(\mathbb{E}_\mu[X]). \quad (9.22)$$

Saturation holds if and only if the operator  $X$  is constant  $\mu$ -almost everywhere.

The proof is similar to the standard measure-theoretic proof. See Appendix A.

**9.6. Zeroth Law of Quantum Selection.** The quantum Jensen's inequality allows us to quantize inequalities for convex functionals presented in this article. Let  $\pi_* := \pi_{U \neq 0} = \text{Id} - \pi_{U=0}$  be the projection operator onto the subspace orthogonal to the null space. Write  $\mu_* := \pi_*\mu$ ,  $p_* := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\pi_*] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\mu_*)$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_*[X] := \mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}[X] = \text{Tr}(X\mu_*) = \text{Tr}(X\pi_*\mu)$ . We say that  $\mathcal{W}$  is in *quantum selective equilibrium* if the fitness operator is constant  $\mu_*$ -almost surely (in which case  $W = \frac{1}{p_*} \text{Id}$   $\mu_*$ -a.s.), or equivalently, if  $W \in \{0, \frac{1}{p_*} \text{Id}\}$   $\mu$ -a.s.

**Proposition 9.9** (Weak Zeroth Law of Quantum Selection). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a quantum evolutionary process. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}_{\mu}(U) \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1. \quad (9.23)$$

This is saturated when  $\mathcal{W}$  is in quantum selective equilibrium.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.2, *mutatis mutandis*, including the saturation condition. Write  $\text{var}_{\mu}(U) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(U - 1)^2] = (1 - p_*) + p_*\mathbb{E}_*[(U - 1)^2]$ . Then by quantum Jensen's inequality,  $\text{var}_{\mu}(U) \geq (1 - p_*) + p_*(\mathbb{E}_*[U] - 1)^2 = \frac{1}{p_*} - 1$ .  $\square$

**9.7. First Law of Quantum Selection.** Define the quantum selective acceleration  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) := \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}_{\mu}(U) = \text{cov}_{\mu}(U^2, U)$ . Because  $U^2$  commutes with  $U$ , this is unhandled.

**Theorem 9.10** (First Law of Quantum Selection). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a quantum evolutionary process. Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2(U) := \partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}_{\mu}(U) \geq \text{var}_{\mu}(U) (1 + \text{var}_{\mu}(U)) \geq 0,$$

with saturation of the first inequality exactly when  $\mathcal{W}$  is in selective equilibrium.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.3, *mutatis mutandis*, including the saturation condition. Write  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\mu}[X] := \mathbb{E}_{UM}[X] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[XU]$ . We have  $\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}_{\mu}(U) = \text{cov}(U^2, U) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\mu}[U^2] - \mathbb{E}[U^2]$ . By quantum Jensen's inequality,  $\partial_{\text{NS}} \text{var}(U) \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\mu}[U]^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^2] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[U^2]^2 - \mathbb{E}[U^2] = \mathbb{E}[U^2] (\mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1)$ .  $\square$

**9.8. Time-Varying Quantum Price Equation.** We consider a time-varying quantum evolutionary process  $\mathcal{W}^{t,t'} : \mu^t \rightarrow \mu^{t'}$ , relating a time-varying family of population density operators  $\mu := (\mu^t)$ . Let  $N^t := \text{Tr}(\mu^t)$  be the population at time  $t$ . Write  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[A] := \frac{1}{N^t} \text{Tr}(AM^t)$  and  $\text{cov}_{\mu}^t(A_1, A_2) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[A_1 A_2] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[A_1] \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[A_2]$ . Write the relative-fitness observable  $U^{t,t'} := \frac{1}{\mathcal{W}} (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^{\dagger} (\text{Id}^{t'})$  for  $\mathcal{W}^{t,t'}$ . Define left local-average and local-change observables:

$$\langle X^{t'} \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'} := (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^{\dagger} (X^{t'}) (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'}) := \langle X^{t'} \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'} - X^t, \quad (9.24)$$

and the right local-average and local-change observables:

$$\langle X^{t'} \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right},t,t'} := (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^{-1} (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^{\dagger} (X^{t'}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'}) := \langle X^{t'} \rangle_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right},t,t'} - X^t, \quad (9.25)$$

The discrete-time quantum Price equations hold for each  $t < t'$  and observables  $X^t$  and  $X^{t'}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu}^{t'}[X^{t'}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[X^t] = \text{cov}_{\mu}^t(X^t, U^{t,t'}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'}) U^{t,t'}] \quad (9.26)$$

$$= \text{cov}_{\mu}^t(U^{t,t'}, X^t) + \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'}) U^{t,t'}] \quad (9.27)$$

We say that  $\mathcal{W} := (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})$  is a *smooth left quantum evolutionary process* if the equivalent conditions to Definition 8.1 hold in the quantum case. Specifically, for each time-varying family of observables  $\mathbf{X} := (X^t)$  we have:

- (1) (Smooth Expectations) The time-varying average is smooth at  $t$ :  $\frac{d\mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[X^t]}{dt} := \lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu}^{t'}[X^{t'}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu}^t[X^t]}{|t' - t|}$ .
- (2) (Relative-Fitness Density) The time-varying relative fitness admits a density at  $t$ , where we take the  $\text{cov}_{\mu}^t$ -limit:  $\Upsilon^t := L^2\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|}$ .

(3) (Left Local-Change Density) The time-varying left and right local changes admit densities at  $t$ , where we take the  $\mathbb{E}_\mu^t$ -limit:

$$\delta^{\text{left},t}(\mathbf{X}) := L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})}{|t' - t|} = L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{(\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^\dagger(X^{t'})(W^{t,t'})^{-1} - X^t}{|t' - t|} \quad (9.28)$$

$$\delta^{\text{right},t}(\mathbf{X}) := L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{right},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})}{|t' - t|} = L^1\text{-}\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \frac{(W^{t,t'})^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})^\dagger(X^{t'}) - X^t}{|t' - t|} \quad (9.29)$$

**Theorem 9.11** (Smooth Quantum Price Equations). Suppose  $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{W}^{t,t'})$  is a smooth quantum process at  $X^t$ . The smooth quantum Price equations hold at  $t$ :

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}_\mu^t}{dt}[X^t] = \text{cov}_\mu^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t) + \mathbb{E}_\mu^t[\delta^{\text{left},t}(\mathbf{X})] \quad (9.30)$$

$$= \text{cov}_\mu^t(\Upsilon^t, X^t) + \mathbb{E}_\mu^t[\delta^{\text{right},t}(\mathbf{X})] \quad (9.31)$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 8.2, *mutatis mutandis*. We begin with the discrete-time left quantum Price equation (9.26). By  $\text{cov}_\mu^t$ -convergence, we have  $\text{cov}_\mu^t(X^t, \frac{U^{t,t'}}{|t'-t|}) \rightarrow \text{cov}_\mu^t(X^t, \Upsilon^t)$ . By  $\mathbb{E}_\mu^t$ -convergence and the product rule for derivatives, we have

$$\lim_{t' \downarrow t} \mathbb{E}_\mu^t \left[ \frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t'}(X^t, X^{t'})U^{t,t'}}{|t' - t|} \right] = \mathbb{E}_\mu^t \left[ \delta^{\text{left},t}(X)U^{t,t} + \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t}(X^t, X^t)\Upsilon^t \right] = \mathbb{E}^t[\delta^{\text{left},t}(\mathbf{X})] \quad (9.32)$$

since  $U^{t,t} = \text{Id}^t$  and  $\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}^{\text{left},t,t}(X^t, X^t) = 0$ . This proves the left time-varying Price equation.  $\square$

## 10. OPEN EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES AND THE KERR-GODFREY-SMITH EQUATION

Kerr and Godfrey-Smith [KGS09] relaxed the assumption (2.2) of a full accounting of the child population, allowing for orphaned children with unaccounted parents. Such open processes have a Price-like equation with a third term. We generalize their approach for open measure-theoretic and quantum processes.

**Example 10.1.** Kerr and Godfrey-Smith considered the combinatorial case of discrete populations  $(I, \mu)$  and  $(I', \mu')$  with population sizes  $N$  and  $N'$ , and an edge set  $C$  from  $I$  to  $I'$ , allowing for orphaned descendent types. They consider the number of edges  $C_*(i)$  from parent  $i$ , and the number of edges  $C^*(i')$  to child  $i'$ . The classical Kerr-Godfrey-Smith equation states that for any observables  $X$  and  $Y$ :

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X] = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_C(X, Y)U] - \text{cov}'(Y, C^*), \quad (10.1)$$

for relative fitness  $U(i) = \frac{C(i)}{N'/N}$  and local change  $\Delta_C(X, Y)(i) = \sum_i \sum_{(i,i') \in C} Y(i') - X(i)C(i)$ .

We define an open evolutionary process  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  to consist of the following:

- (1) Sub-populations (“demes”) of parented and orphaned children  $\mu'_\pi$  and  $\mu'_\nu = \mu' - \mu'_\pi$ ;
- (2) A (closed) evolutionary process  $w_\pi : \mu \mapsto \mu'_\pi$ , mapping parents to their children.

Write the child deme sizes  $N'_\pi := \mu'_\pi(I')$  and  $N'_\nu := \mu'_\nu(I') = N' - N'_\pi$ . Write the proportions  $p'_\pi := \frac{N'_\pi}{N'}$  and  $p'_\nu := \frac{N'_\nu}{N'} = 1 - p'_\pi$ . The selective coefficient of the closed process is  $\overline{W}_\pi := \frac{N'_\pi}{N} = p'_\pi \overline{W}$ . A type can have parented and orphaned children (i.e.,  $\mu'_\pi(B) > 0$  and  $\mu'_\nu(B) > 0$ ), for example a child with two parents, one accounted for and one not. Write the deme expectations  $\mathbb{E}'_\pi[Y] := \frac{1}{N'_\pi} \int Y \mu'_\pi$  and  $\mathbb{E}'_\nu[Y] := \frac{1}{N'_\nu} \int Y \mu'_\nu$ , so that  $\mathbb{E}'[Y] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}'_\pi[Y] + p'_\nu \mathbb{E}'_\nu[Y]$ .

**Lemma 10.2** (Open Tower Property). The child demes  $\mu'_\pi$  and  $\mu'_\nu$  are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu'$ , with non-negative Radon-Nikodym densities  $\pi = \frac{d\mu'_\pi}{d\mu'}$  and  $\nu = \frac{d\mu'_\nu}{d\mu'}$ , and  $\pi + \nu = 1$   $\mu'$ -a.s. The expectations satisfy  $\mathbb{E}'[Y\pi] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}'_\pi[Y]$  and  $\mathbb{E}'[Y\nu] = p'_\nu \mathbb{E}'_\nu[Y]$ , so  $\mathbb{E}'[\pi] = p'_\pi$  and  $\mathbb{E}'[\nu] = p'_\nu$ . The tower property holds for the parented children:

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y\pi] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}'_\pi[Y] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U], \quad (10.2)$$

and the open tower property holds for the entire population:

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] + \mathbb{E}'[Y\nu] = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] + \text{cov}(Y, \nu) + p'_\nu \mathbb{E}'[Y] \quad (10.3)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] + \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}(Y, \nu) = \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] - \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}(Y, \pi). \quad (10.4)$$

*Proof.* Child deme sizes are non-negative, so  $\max\{\pi(B), \nu(B)\} \leq \mu'(B)$ . If  $\mu'(B) = 0$ , then  $\pi(B) = 0 = \nu(0)$ , hence the child demes are absolutely continuous. We compute  $\mathbb{E}'[Y\pi] = \frac{1}{N'} \int Y \pi \mu' = \frac{p'_\pi}{N'} \int Y \mu'_\pi = p'_\pi \mathbb{E}'_\pi[Y]$ , and similarly for  $\nu$ . We compute:  $\mathbb{E}'[Y] = \frac{1}{N'} \int Y \mu' = \frac{1}{N'} \iint Y w_i \mu + \frac{1}{N'} \int Y \nu \mu' = \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_w U] + \mathbb{E}'[Y\nu] = \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_w U] + \mathbb{E}'[Y(1 - \pi)]$ , proving the first identity of (10.3). The second identity follows since  $\mathbb{E}'[Y\nu] = \text{cov}(Y, \nu) + \mathbb{E}'[\nu] \mathbb{E}'[Y]$ . The first identity of (10.4) follows from moving the third term of (10.3) to the left side, and dividing by  $1 - p'_\nu = p'_\pi$ . The second identity follows from  $\text{cov}(Y, \nu) = \text{cov}(Y, 1 - \pi) = -\text{cov}(Y, \pi)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 10.3** (Kerr-Godfrey-Smith Equation). Let  $w$  be an finite-variance open process. For any observables  $X$  on  $I$  and  $Y$  on  $I'$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X] = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] + \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'(Y, \nu) \quad (10.5)$$

$$= \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] - \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'(Y, \pi). \quad (10.6)$$

*Proof.* We write  $\mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X(U - 1)] + \mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[XU]$ , then apply the open tower property (10.4).  $\square$

The classical Kerr-Godfrey-Smith equation (10.1) is recovered when the process  $w_\pi$  can be represented a kernel against some background measure  $\lambda'$ . This holds if each  $w_i$  is absolutely continuous to  $\lambda'$ , with  $w_\pi(i, i') := \frac{dw_i}{d\lambda'}(i')$  satisfying the  $w_i(B) = \int_B w_\pi(i, i') \lambda'(di')$ . We write the dual fitness  $W_\pi^*(i') := \int_I w_\pi(i, i') \mu(di)$ , representing the infinitesimal amount of parented child population at  $i'$ . The dual fitness satisfies the identity  $\frac{1}{p'_\pi} \mathbb{E}'[W_\pi^*] = \mathbb{E}'_\pi[W_\pi^*] = 1$ . Proof. We interchange integrals by Fubini's theorem:  $\mathbb{E}'_\pi[W_\pi^*] = \frac{1}{N'} \int_I \int_{I'} w_\pi(i, i') \mu'_\pi(di') \mu(di) = \frac{1}{N'} \int_I W_\pi(i) \mu(di) = \frac{1}{\overline{W}_\pi} \overline{W}_\pi = 1$ .

For example, if the parented child population  $\mu'_\pi$  is discrete, then any process admits a kernel  $w_\pi(i, i') = w_i(\{i'\})$  against counting measure, with dual fitness  $W_\pi^*(i') = \int_I w_i(\{i'\}) \mu(di)$ .

**Corollary 10.4** (Dual-Fitness Version of Kerr-Godfrey-Smith Equation). If  $w_\pi$  admits a kernel  $w_\pi(i, i')$  relative to  $\lambda'$ , then  $\mu'_\pi$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\lambda'$ , with  $\frac{d\mu'_\pi}{d\lambda'}(i') = W_\pi^*(i')$ . Consequently, for any observables  $X$  and  $Y$ :

$$\mathbb{E}'[Y] - \mathbb{E}[X] = \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{w_\pi} U] - \frac{1}{N'} \int_{I'} Y(i') W_\pi^*(i') \lambda'(di') + 1. \quad (10.7)$$

*Proof.* For any observable  $Y$ , we use the kernel property and interchange integrals by Fubini's theorem to show that  $\frac{d\mu'_\pi}{d\lambda'} = W_\pi^* \mu'$ -a.s.:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'_\pi(di') &= \int_I \int_{I'} Y(i') w_i(di') \mu(di) = \int_I \int_{I'} Y(i') w_\pi(i, i') \lambda'(di') \mu(di) \\ &= \int_{I'} Y(i') \left( \int_I w_\pi(i, i') \mu(di) \right) \lambda'(di') = \int_{I'} Y(i') W_\pi^*(i') \lambda'(di'). \end{aligned} \quad (10.8)$$

Consequently,  $-\text{cov}'\left(Y, \frac{\pi}{p'_\pi}\right) = -\frac{1}{N'_\pi} \int_{I'} Y(i') \mu'_\pi(di') + 1 = -\frac{1}{N'_\pi} \int_{I'} Y(i') W_\pi^*(i') \lambda'(di') + 1$ .  $\square$

Recall the quantum evolutionary formalism of Section 9. An open quantum process consists of parented and orphaned child density operators  $\mu'_\pi = \pi \mu'$  and  $\mu'_\nu = \nu \mu'$  satisfying  $\pi + \nu = \text{Id}_{H'}$ , and a closed quantum process  $\mathcal{W}_\pi : \mu \mapsto \mu'_\pi$ . By a similar proof as Lemma 10.2, the quantum open tower properties hold:  $\mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_\pi}^{\text{left}} U] = \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(Y, \nu) = -\frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(Y, \pi)$ .

**Theorem 10.5** (Quantum Kerr-Godfrey-Smith Equation). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be an open quantum process. The left and right quantum Kerr-Godfrey-Smith equations hold:

$$\mathbb{E}'_{\mu'}[Y] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[X] = \text{cov}_\mu(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_\pi}^{\text{left}} U] + \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(Y, \nu) \quad (10.9)$$

$$= \text{cov}(X, U) + \mathbb{E}[\langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_\pi}^{\text{left}} U] - \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(Y, \pi) \quad (10.10)$$

$$= \text{cov}_\mu(U, X) + \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_\pi}^{\text{right}}] + \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(\nu, Y) \quad (10.11)$$

$$= \text{cov}(U, X) + \mathbb{E}[U \langle Y \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_\pi}^{\text{right}}] - \frac{1}{p'_\pi} \text{cov}'_{\mu'}(\pi, Y) \quad (10.12)$$

## Part 2. Selective Entropy (Kullback-Leibler Divergence of Relative Fitness)

### 11. DEFINITION OF SELECTIVE ENTROPY AND GIBBS'S INEQUALITIES

In Part 2, we introduce the selective entropy to quantify “the amount of selection” of a process, by generalizing Kullback-Leibler divergence to the case of evolutionary processes. This represents a “biological entropy” or “negentropy”. Selective entropy is non-positive, and bounded above by a negative value in the strict selective-equilibrium case. We prove a Second Law, showing that the selective change of selective entropy is non-positive, as well as a speed limit. Both inequalities are saturated in the selective equilibrium case. Write  $U := W/\overline{W}$  for the relative fitness function, i.e.,  $U(i) := w_i(I')/\overline{W}$ .

**Definition 11.1** (Selective Entropy). We say that a process is finite-entropy if  $\mathbb{E}[|U \log U|] < \infty$ . For any finite-entropy process, we define the selective entropy as the average of  $-U \log U$ :

$$S_{\text{NS}} := \mathbb{E}[-U \log U] = \frac{1}{N} \int \left( -\frac{W(i)}{\overline{W}} \log \frac{W(i)}{\overline{W}} \right) \mu(di). \quad (11.1)$$

The selective entropy is fully concentrated in the selective part of a process. That is, if  $w$  and  $\widehat{w}$  both have the same selective part  $w_{\text{NS}}$ , i.e., the same relative fitness function  $U$ , then they have the same selective entropy  $S_{\text{NS}}$ . The environmental part does not contribute to selective entropy. For purely selective processes (where  $\mathbb{E}'[X] = \mathbb{E}[UX]$ ), the selective entropy is the Kullback-Leibler divergence of  $\mathbb{E}'$  relative to  $\mathbb{E}$ . That is, selective entropy is exactly the familiar relative entropy from information theory. For purely environmental

processes (i.e.,  $U = 1$   $\mu$ -a.s.), selective entropy vanishes. For all other processes, selective entropy measures the degree to which selective effects are present in the process  $w$ , and the Price equation ensures all remaining effects are environmental.

**Remark 11.2.** (Sign Convention) We choose sign convention to be consistent with classical information theory and statistical mechanics. The non-positive selective entropy  $S_{\text{NS}}$  has the biological role of “negentropy” [Sch44], and in Section 16, we introduce the non-negative environmental entropy  $S_{\text{EC}}$  to represent the classical physical role of dynamical entropy. The total entropy is given by  $S_{\text{tot}} := S_{\text{NS}} + S_{\text{EC}}$ , which is negative or positive depending on whether selective effects outweigh environmental effects.

**11.1. Selective Entropy Bounds.** We now state and prove that  $S_{\text{NS}} \leq 0$ , which corresponds to the Gibbs’ inequality in classical information theory. This inequality is saturated exactly in the case of purely environmental processes (in which case  $S_{\text{NS}} = 0$ , otherwise  $S_{\text{NS}} < 0$ ). Thus the selective entropy is a proxy for “selectiveness” in a process.

**Lemma 11.3** (Weak Gibbs Inequality). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process with relative fitness  $U$ , and let  $S_{\text{NS}} := \mathbb{E}[-U \log U]$  be the selective entropy of  $w$ . The Gibbs’ inequality holds:

$$S_{\text{NS}} \leq 0. \quad (11.2)$$

This is an equality ( $S_{\text{NS}} = 0$ ) if and only if  $w$  is purely environmental (i.e.,  $U$  is a.s. constant with  $U = 1$ ).

*Proof.* Observe that  $-U \log U$  is a concave function of  $U$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[U] = 1$ . By Jensen’s inequality, we have:

$$S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[-U \log U] \leq -\mathbb{E}[U] \log \mathbb{E}[U] = -1 \log 1 = 0, \quad (11.3)$$

with equality if and only if  $U$  is constant (with  $U = \mathbb{E}[U] = 1$  almost surely).  $\square$

We strengthen (11.2) and derive a window (11.5) in which selective entropy can fluctuate. Recall from Section 3 that  $w$  is in selective equilibrium when  $U \in \{0, 1/p_*\}$  a.s. The window (11.5) collapses to a single value when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium (in which case  $S_{\text{NS}} = \log p_*$ ), and otherwise the inequalities are strict. Since lost population does not contribute to entropy ( $0 \log 0 = 0$ ), all selective entropy is generated by the childbearing population.

Define the childbearing population  $\mu_*(A) := \mu(A \cap \{W > 0\})$ , with population size  $N_* = p_* N$ . Define the childbearing expectation  $\mathbb{E}_*[X] := \frac{1}{p_*} \mathbb{E}[1_{U>0} X]$ , and the childbearing variance  $\text{var}_*(X) := \mathbb{E}_*[X^2] - \mathbb{E}_*[X]^2$ . Recall  $U_* = p_* U$ . Note that the general variance and childbearing variance are related as follows:

$$\text{var}(U) = \mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1 = p_* \mathbb{E}_* \left[ \left( \frac{U_*}{p_*} \right)^2 \right] - 1 = \frac{1}{p_*} \mathbb{E}_*[U_*^2] - 1 = \frac{1}{p_*} \text{var}_*(U_*) + \frac{1}{p_*} - 1. \quad (11.4)$$

**Theorem 11.4** (Strong Gibbs Inequality). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process with selective entropy  $S_{\text{NS}}$ , and let  $p_* = \mu(W > 0)/N$  be the childbearing population proportion. Then:

$$\log p_* - \log(1 + \text{var}_*(U_*)) = -\log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log p_*, \quad (11.5)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case (in which case  $S_{\text{NS}} = \log p_* = -\log(1 + \text{var}(U))$ ), and otherwise the inequalities are strict.

*Proof.* We decompose the expectation into the sum of childless and childbearing parts:

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = p_0 \mathbb{E}_0[X] + p_* \mathbb{E}_*[X] \quad (11.6)$$

where  $p_0 = 1 - p_*$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_*[X] := 1/p_* \mathbb{E}[1_{U>0}X]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_0[X] := 1/p_0 \mathbb{E}[1_{U=0}X]$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}_*[U] = 1/p_*$ . We apply the decomposition (11.6) to  $-U \log U$ . Since  $0 \log 0 = 0$ , we have:

$$S_{\text{NS}} = 0 + p_* \mathbb{E}_*[-U \log U]. \quad (11.7)$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_*$  is a probability expectation and  $-U \log U$  is concave, we use Jensen's inequality:

$$S_{\text{NS}} \leq -p_* \mathbb{E}_*[U] \log \mathbb{E}_*[U] = -p_* \frac{1}{p_*} \log \frac{1}{p_*} = \log p_* \leq 0. \quad (11.8)$$

This proves the upper bound for (11.5). This is saturated when  $U$  is constant  $\mu_*$ -a.s., i.e., the selective-equilibrium case. For the lower bound, observe that  $\mathbb{E}[U \cdot]$  is a probability expectation and  $-\log x$  is convex, therefore by Jensen's inequality:

$$S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[U(-\log U)] \geq -\log \mathbb{E}[U^2]. \quad (11.9)$$

This is saturated exactly when  $U$  is constant  $U\mu$ -almost surely. Since  $U\mu$  and  $\mu_*$  are mutually absolutely continuous, the saturation condition is equivalent to minimal selectivity.  $\square$

This implies a strong version of the Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2), with an improved lower bound based on selective entropy.

**Corollary 11.5** (Strong Zeroth Law). The inequalities (11.5) are equivalent to the following:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}(U) = \text{var}(U) \geq e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1 \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_* \geq e^{S_{\text{NS}}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \text{var } U}, \quad (11.10)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case.

## 12. SELECTIVE CHANGE OF SELECTIVE ENTROPY AND THE SECOND LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION

In this section, we analyze the change of the selective entropy functional across generations. We decompose the selective change and environmental change of the functional, and prove bounds showing the ‘‘typical’’ tendency of change. The selective change of selective entropy is negative, representing that selection always amplifies existing selective effects.

Consider composable processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ , with relative fitnesses  $U$  and  $U'$ . We define the change of selective entropy as the difference in selective entropies:

$$\Delta(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) := S'_{\text{NS}} - S_{\text{NS}} = \Delta(-U \log U, -U' \log U') = \mathbb{E}'[-U' \log U'] - \mathbb{E}[-U \log U]. \quad (12.1)$$

Define the selective and environmental changes of selective entropy:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} := \partial_{\text{NS}}(-U \log U) = \text{cov}(-U \log U, U) = -\mathbb{E}[(U - 1)U \log U] \quad (12.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) &:= \partial_{\text{EC}}(-U \log U, -U' \log U') \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(-U \log U, -U' \log U')U] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle -U' \log U' \rangle_w + U \log U)U]. \end{aligned} \quad (12.3)$$

The functional Price equation (Corollary 5.1) decomposes the selective-entropy change as the sum of selective and environmental changes:

$$\Delta(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) \quad (12.4)$$

$$= \text{cov}(-U \log U, U) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_w(-U \log U, -U' \log U')U]. \quad (12.5)$$

**12.1. Selective Change of Selective Entropy.** Our main result is that the selective-change term  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}}$  is always non-positive, i.e., vanishing in the purely environmental case and otherwise strictly negative. The meaning is that *under the effect of natural selection, selective entropy cannot increase*. We state a Weak Second Law showing non-positivity, saturated in the purely environmental case, and a strong Second Law providing a chain of inequalities, saturated in the selective equilibrium case. The Weak Second Law follows from the non-positivity of the function  $-(x-1)x \log x$ , and does not rely on concavity. The Strong Second Law does rely on concavity of the functions  $-x \log x$  and  $\log x$ .

**Proposition 12.1** (Weak Second Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  be an evolutionary process with  $\mathbb{E}[|U^2 \log U|] < \infty$ . The selective change in selective entropy is non-positive:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} \leq 0. \quad (12.6)$$

The inequality is saturated exactly for purely environmental processes, and is otherwise strictly negative.

*Proof.* Observe that the real-valued functions  $x-1$  and  $\log x$  always have the same sign, therefore the function  $-x(x-1) \log x$  is non-positive. Thus:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[-(U-1)U \log U] \leq 0. \quad (12.7)$$

The function  $-x(x-1) \log x$  vanishes only at  $x=0$  and  $x=1$ . If  $w$  is purely environmental ( $U=1$  a.s.), then  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[(-1-1)1 \log 1] = 0$ . If  $w$  is not purely environmental, then there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  and measurable  $A \subseteq I$  on which  $U \notin \{0, 1\}$  and  $-U(U-1) \log U < -\epsilon$ . Thus

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} = -\mathbb{E}[1_{I-A}(U-1)U \log U] - \mathbb{E}[1_A(U-1)U \log U] \leq 0 - \mathbb{E}[1_A]\epsilon = -\frac{\mu(A)}{N}\epsilon < 0. \quad (12.8)$$

□

**Remark 12.2** (Selective-Equilibrium Case). Recall that  $p_* = \mu(U > 0)/N$  is the proportion of childless population. If  $w$  is in selective equilibrium, then we can specify selective change of selective entropy explicitly. Since relative fitness takes exactly two values 0 and  $1/p_*$  almost surely, the selective change of selective entropy takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} &= \text{cov}(-U \log U, U) = -\mathbb{E}[U(U-1) \log U] \\ &= -p_* \mathbb{E}_*[U(U-1) \log U] = -p_* \frac{1}{p_*} \left( \frac{1}{p_*} - 1 \right) \log \frac{1}{p_*} \\ &= -\left( \frac{1}{p_*} - 1 \right) \log \frac{1}{p_*} < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12.9)$$

Recall that for selective-equilibrium processes,  $S_{\text{NS}} = -\log \frac{1}{p_*}$  and  $\text{var}(U) = \frac{1}{p_*} - 1$ . Consequently, in the selective-equilibrium case,

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} = \text{var}(U)S_{\text{NS}}. \quad (12.10)$$

This provides a baseline for improving the Weak Second Law, by proving  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}} \leq \text{var}(U)S_{\text{NS}}$ , which itself is further bounded by the (non-positive) expression  $(e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1)S_{\text{NS}}$ . The meaning of this statement is that  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{NS}}$  is “maximally controlled” in the selective-equilibrium case (in which case it equals  $(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1) \log p_*$ ), and otherwise it is strictly bounded by these quantities. This provides a “minimal velocity” for selective entropy, achieved only in selective equilibrium.

**Theorem 12.3** (Strong Second Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  be an evolutionary process with  $\mathbb{E}[|U^2 \log U|] < \infty$ . Let  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} := \text{cov}(-U \log U, U)$  be the selective change of selective entropy. The following upper bound holds:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) \log \frac{1}{p_*} \leq 0, \quad (12.11)$$

where all but the last inequalities are saturated in the selective-equilibrium case, and are otherwise strict inequalities. All quantities vanish exactly in the purely environmental case, otherwise they are all strictly negative.

*Proof.* We write  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}}$  as the sum of two terms, and we analyze an upper bound for each separately. Observe that:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} = \text{cov}(-U \log U, U) = \mathbb{E}((-U \log U - S_{\text{NS}})U) = \mathbb{E}[-U^2 \log U] - S_{\text{NS}}. \quad (12.12)$$

We rewrite the first term as a weighted probability expectation of the concave function  $-x \log x$ . Observe that relative fitness  $U$  is a probability density function, since  $U \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[U] = 1$ . Consequently, Jensen's inequality implies:

$$\mathbb{E}[-U^2 \log U] = \mathbb{E}[U(-U \log U)] \leq -\mathbb{E}[U^2] \log \mathbb{E}[U^2]. \quad (12.13)$$

The strong inequality (12.13) is saturated exactly in the case that  $U$  is constant  $U\mu/N$ -a.s. Since  $\mu_*$  and  $U/N$  are mutually absolutely continuous, saturation is equivalent to the selective-equilibrium case (i.e.,  $U = 1$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s.).

For the second term, we use the strong lower bound for selective entropy, which translates into a strong *upper* bound for the negative selective entropy:

$$-S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) = \log \mathbb{E}[U^2], \quad (12.14)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case. Combining (12.13) and (12.14), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} &\leq -\mathbb{E}[U^2] \log \mathbb{E}[U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^2] = -(\mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1) \log \mathbb{E}[U^2] \\ &= -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)), \end{aligned} \quad (12.15)$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[U^2] = 1 + \text{var}(U)$ . The bound (11.5) states that  $-\log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq S_{\text{NS}}$ . When we apply this to (12.15), we have:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}}. \quad (12.16)$$

The variance lower bound (11.10) ( $\text{var}(U) \geq e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1$ ) becomes an *upper* bound when we multiply by the non-positive  $S_{\text{NS}}$ . Thus  $\text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}}$ .

For the final non-trivial inequality, we have  $S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log p_*$  from (11.5), hence  $(e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) \log p_*$ . Similarly, we have  $e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1 \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - 1$ . When we multiply by the non-positive  $\log p_*$ , we obtain the inequality  $(e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) \log p_*$ .  $\square$

This leads to a selective feedback loop. If a process is purely environmental, then selective entropy does not change. However, in the presence of even minimal selective effects (such as selective equilibrium), then the strictly negative quantity  $(e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}}$  “drives” selective entropy change downward. This forces *some* change across evolutionary processes. Thus in the presence of any selective effects, a system is driven to have even more selection, as measured by more negative  $S_{\text{NS}}$ . Nonetheless, environmental effects can effect  $S_{\text{NS}}$  arbitrarily.

**Corollary 12.4.** Suppose that  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) = 0$  (such as the purely-selective case). Then:

$$S'_{\text{NS}} - S_{\text{NS}} = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq 0. \quad (12.17)$$

**12.2. The Selective Speed Limit.** The Second Law (12.11) provides a minimal speed that selection must occur at, driving  $S_{\text{NS}}$  ever more negative. We use a similar technique to prove a speed limit, showing that  $S_{\text{NS}}$  cannot change in an unbounded way. The saturation condition is again given by selective equilibrium. This requires additional moment assumptions.

**Theorem 12.5** (Selective Speed Limits). Let  $w$  be finite-variance.

(1) Suppose  $\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c'}] < \infty$  for some  $c' > 0$ . The basic speed limit holds:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \geq \log \frac{1}{p_*} + \sup_{c \in (0, c')} \left\{ -\frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \right\} \quad (12.18)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} = -\left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) \log \frac{1}{p_*}$ ).

(2) Suppose  $\mathbb{E}[|U^{2+c'} \log U|] < \infty$  for some  $c' > 0$ . If there exists  $c_* \in (0, c')$  satisfying the functional equation

$$1 = \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{1+c_*}]^{c_*}}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]^{c_*-1} \mathbb{E}[U^{2+c_*}]}, \quad (12.19)$$

then the continuum speed limit at  $c_*$  holds:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \geq \frac{1}{p_*} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c_*} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c_*}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} = \log \frac{1}{p_*} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c_*} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{1+c_*}]^{c_*}}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]^{c_*-1} \mathbb{E}[U^2]}, \quad (12.20)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case.

(3) Suppose  $\mathbb{E}[|U^{2+c'} \log U|] < \infty$  for some  $c' > 0$ . The infinitary speed limit holds:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \geq \log \frac{1}{p_*} - \mathbb{E}[U^2 \log U]. \quad (12.21)$$

with saturation in the selective-equilibrium case.

*Proof.* Proof of (1). Consider arbitrary  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . We apply Jensen's inequality to the convex functionals  $-\log x$  and  $x \log x$ , and compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} = \text{cov}(-U \log U, U) &= \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E}[-U^2 \log U^c] + \mathbb{E}[U \log U] \\ &= \frac{p_* \mathbb{E}_* [U^2]}{c} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_* [U^2]} \mathbb{E}_* [U^2 (-\log U^c)] + p_* \mathbb{E}_* [U \log U] \\ &\geq -\frac{p_* \mathbb{E}_* [U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}_* [U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}_* [U^2]} + p_* \mathbb{E}_* [U] \log \mathbb{E}_* [U] \\ &= -\frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} - \log p_* \end{aligned} \quad (12.22)$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[UX] = p_* \mathbb{E}_*[UX]$  for any observable  $X$ , in particular,  $\mathbb{E}_*[U] = \frac{1}{p_*}$ . Saturation holds when  $U$  and  $U^c$  are constant  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, which is equivalent to  $U$  being constant  $\mu_*$ -almost surely, i.e., the case of selective equilibrium. Taking suprema over all  $c$  yields the first identity of (12.18). Setting  $c = \mathbb{E}[U^2] = 1 + \text{var}(U)$  yields the second identity of (12.18).

Proof of (2). To optimize (12.18), we find stationary points  $c_*$  by differentiating the argument of the supremum in  $c$  and solving for zero:

$$0 = \frac{d}{dc} \left( -\frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c^2} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{1+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}, \quad (12.23)$$

hence

$$0 = \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{1+c}]^c}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]^{c-1} \mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]} \right) \quad (12.24)$$

which is equivalent to (12.19). For optimal  $c_*$ , apply (12.19) to (12.18), which yields (12.20).

Proof of (3). When we take the limsup as  $c \rightarrow 0$  in (12.18), the expression is indeterminate. Note that  $\frac{d}{dc} \log F(c) = \frac{1}{F(c)} \frac{dF}{dc}(c)$  by the chain rule, and  $\frac{d}{dc} \mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}] = \frac{d}{dc} \mathbb{E}[e^{(2+c) \log U}] = \mathbb{E}[U^{2+c} \log U]$  by bringing the limit into the expectation [Fol13]. Thus by L'Hôpital's rule:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} &\geq -\log p_* + \limsup_{c \rightarrow 0} \left\{ -\frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{c} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \right\} \\ &= -\log p_* + \limsup_{c \rightarrow 0} \left\{ -\mathbb{E}[U^2] \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2]}{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c}]} \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^{2+c} \log U]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \right\} \\ &= -\log p_* - \mathbb{E}[U^2 \log U]. \end{aligned} \quad (12.25)$$

□

Combining the Second Law and the Selective Speed Limit, we have the following.

**Corollary 12.6.** Let  $w$  be finite-variance with  $\mathbb{E}[|U^{2+c'} \log U|] < \infty$  for some  $c' > 0$ . Then:

$$\log \frac{1}{p_*} - \mathbb{E}[U^2 \log U] \leq \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log \frac{1}{p_*} - \frac{1}{p_*} \log \frac{1}{p_*}, \quad (12.26)$$

with saturation when  $w$  is in selective equilibrium. In particular, selective equilibrium is equivalent to the identity

$$-S_{\text{NS}} - \mathbb{E}[U^2 \log U] = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} = -S_{\text{NS}} + \mathbb{E}[U^2] S_{\text{NS}} = \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}}. \quad (12.27)$$

*Proof.* By the Weak Zeroth Law (Proposition 3.2) and Strong Gibbs' inequality (Theorem 11.4), selective equilibrium is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E}[U^2] = 1 + \text{var}(U) = \frac{1}{p_*}$  and  $S_{\text{NS}} = -\log \frac{1}{p_*}$ . □

**12.3. Selective Acceleration of Selective Entropy.** We define the selective acceleration of selective entropy as the selective change of the selective change:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} := \partial_{\text{NS}} \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} := \text{cov}(-(U-1)U \log U, U) = \mathbb{E}[-(U-1)^2 U \log U]. \quad (12.28)$$

The next result gives an upper bound on the selective acceleration of selective entropy, amplifying the selective feedback loop: in the presence of non-trivial selective effects, the selective velocity in the second generation is more negative than the selective velocity in the first generation.

**Theorem 12.7** (Strong Bounds for Selective Acceleration). Let  $w$  be a process for which  $\mathbb{E}[|(U-1)^2 U \log U|] < \infty$ . Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 \leq 0, \quad (12.29)$$

and

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} \geq -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 - \text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)^3} = \text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)^4} \quad (12.30)$$

with saturation of the first inequalities of (12.29) and (12.30) exactly in the purely environmental case (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} = 0$ ), or in the selective-equilibrium case with

$p_* = 1/2$  (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} = -2 \log 4 \approx -1.204$ ). In all other cases,  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} < -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 < 0$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2] = \text{var}(U)$ . We use Jensen's inequality for the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} &= \mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2(-U \log U)] = \text{var}(U) \frac{1}{\text{var}(U)} \mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2(-U \log U)] \\ &\leq -\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U]}{\text{var}(U)}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.31)$$

with saturation when  $(U-1)^2 = \text{var}(U)$  almost surely, i.e., when  $U = 1 \pm \sqrt{\text{var}(U)}$  almost surely. We again use Jensen's inequality to compute

$$\mathbb{E}[U(U-1)^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[U^2] - 1)^2 = \text{var}(U)^2, \quad (12.32)$$

with saturation when  $U$  is constant  $U\mu$ -almost surely, i.e., the selective-equilibrium case.

For each  $x$ , the function  $y \mapsto -x \log y$  is decreasing. Then for each  $y'$ , the function  $x \mapsto -x \log y'$  is also decreasing. Applying (12.32) to (12.31) twice, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U]}{\text{var}(U)} &\leq -\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U] \log \frac{\text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)} \leq -\text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)} \\ &= -\text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12.33)$$

For the lower bound, we compute via Jensen's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} &= \text{cov}(-(U-1)U \log U, U) = \mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2(-U \log U)] \\ &\geq -\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U^2]}{\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U]}{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.34)$$

where we use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(U-1)^2 U^2] &= \mathbb{E}[U^4 - 2U^2 + 1] = \text{var}(U^2) + \mathbb{E}[U^2]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[U^2] + 1 \\ &= \text{var}(U^2) + (\text{var}(U) + 1)^2 - 2(1 + \text{var}(U)) + 1 \\ &= \text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12.35)$$

Combine (12.32) and the fact that  $(x, y) \mapsto x \log y$  is increasing in both arguments, so

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} &\geq \text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2} = -\text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)^2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 - \text{var}(U)^2 \log \frac{\text{var}(U^2) + \text{var}(U)^2}{\text{var}(U)^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.36)$$

For the saturation conditions, suppose that  $U = 1 \pm \sqrt{\text{var}(U)}$  a.s. and  $w$  is in selective equilibrium, so that  $1/p_* = 1 + \sqrt{\text{var}(U)} = 1 + \sqrt{1/p_* - 1}$ . Solving for  $p_*$ , we have  $1/p_* - 1 = \sqrt{1/p_* - 1}$ , so  $1/p_* - 1 = 0$  or  $1/p_* - 1 = 1$ . In the first case,  $p_* = 1$  so  $w$  is purely environmental. In the second case,  $p_* = 1/2$ .  $\square$

### 13. ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE OF SELECTIVE ENTROPY

We analyze the environmental change of selective entropy. Recall the intergenerational relative fitness and its average from Section 6:

$$R(i, i') := \frac{U'(i')}{U(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{R}_w(i) := \langle R(\cdot|i) \rangle_w := \frac{\langle U' \rangle_w(i)}{U(i)}. \quad (13.1)$$

Using the definition, we have the identity:

$$\mathbb{E}[U^2 \bar{R}_w] = \mathbb{E}[U \langle U' \rangle_w] = \mathbb{E}[U'] = 1, \quad (13.2)$$

since  $U'$  is the relative fitness for  $w'$ .

Observe the elementary pointwise identity for any observables  $X$  and  $Y$ :

$$-Y \log Y + X \log X = -X \frac{Y}{X} \log \frac{Y}{X} - \left( \frac{Y}{X} - 1 \right) X \log X \quad (13.3)$$

In particular, when  $X = U$  and  $Y = U'$ , we have

$$-U' \log U' + U \log U = -UR \log R - (R - 1)U \log U. \quad (13.4)$$

When we average (13.4), this implies for environmental change:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) &= \mathbb{E}[\langle (-U' \log U')_w + U \log U \rangle] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\langle -UR \log R - (R - 1)U \log U \rangle_w U] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\langle -R \log R \rangle_w U] - \mathbb{E}[(\bar{R}_w - 1)U^2 \log U]. \end{aligned} \quad (13.5)$$

We now state and prove the upper bound. We use a double Jensen's inequality approach, first leveraging concavity of the function  $-R \log R$  and the measure  $\langle \cdot \rangle_w(i)$  for each  $i$ , then concavity of  $\bar{R}_w \log \bar{R}_w$  against a certain weighted measure. Recall stationarity conditions from Section 6: the coupled process  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary if  $R = 1$  a.s., weakly stationary if  $\bar{R}_w = 1$  a.s., and locally homogeneous if  $R$  is constant a.s..

**Theorem 13.1** (Strong Upper Bound for  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}})$ ). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes. Then the environmental change of selective entropy satisfies the upper bound:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) \leq \log \mathbb{E}[U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3] \quad (13.6)$$

This inequality is saturated exactly in the case that  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary (in which case  $\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) = 0$ ).

*Proof.* We start by analyzing the first term of (13.5). First we apply Jensen's inequality to  $-R \log R$  using the measure  $\langle \cdot \rangle_w$ , then we apply Jensen's inequality to  $-\bar{R}_w \log R$  using the measure  $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \mathbb{E}[U^2 \cdot]$ . Note  $\mathbb{E}[U^2 \bar{R}_w] = \mathbb{E}[U'] = 1$ . We compute:

$$\mathbb{E}[U^2 \langle -R \log R \rangle] \leq \mathbb{E}[U^2 \langle -\bar{R}_w \log \bar{R}_w \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[U^2] \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \mathbb{E}[U^2 \langle -\bar{R}_w \log \bar{R}_w \rangle] \quad (13.7)$$

$$\leq -\mathbb{E}[U^2 \bar{R}_w] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U^2 \bar{R}_w]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} = -\mathbb{E}'[U'] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}'[U']}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} = \log \mathbb{E}[U^2]., \quad (13.8)$$

Inequality (13.7) is saturated exactly in the case that, for each  $i$ ,  $R$  is constant (and equal to  $\bar{R}_w$ ), meaning locally homogeneous. Inequality (13.8) is saturated exactly in the case that  $\bar{R}_w = 1$  a.s., meaning weakly stationary. Both occur exactly in the strongly stationary case.

We split the second term of (13.5) into two terms, and apply Jensen's inequality to each:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbb{E}[(\bar{R}_w - 1)U^2 \log U] &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}_w(-U^2 \log U^2)] + \mathbb{E}[U^2 \log U] \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}_w U^2] \log \mathbb{E}[\bar{R}_w U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3] = \log \mathbb{E}[U^3] \end{aligned} \quad (13.9)$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}_w U^2] = \mathbb{E}[U \langle U' \rangle_w] = \mathbb{E}'[U'] = 1$  and  $1 \log 1 = 0$ . The first inequality of (13.9) is saturated when  $U$  is constant  $\bar{R}_w \mu$ -a.s., i.e., the strongly stationary case; and the second inequality of (13.9) is satisfied when  $U^2$  is constant  $U \mu$ -a.s., i.e., selective equilibrium.  $\square$

An upper bound for the full change  $\Delta(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}})$  immediately follows.

**Corollary 13.2.** Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) = S'_{\text{NS}} - S_{\text{NS}} &= \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{NS}}, S'_{\text{NS}}) \\ &\leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) + \log E[U^2] + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3] \\ &= (1 - \text{var}(U)) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) + \log \mathbb{E}[U^3], \end{aligned} \quad (13.10)$$

with saturation exactly when  $w$  is strongly stationary.

*Proof.* This follows from Theorems 12.3 and 13.1. Observe that  $\log E[U^2] = \log(1 + \text{var}(U))$ . If  $(w, w')$  is strongly stationary, then  $w$  is purely environmental hence in selective equilibrium, so the bound on the first term is saturated.  $\square$

#### 14. MULTI-LEVEL SELECTIVE ENTROPY

We apply the multi-level Price equation to selective entropy, allowing us to isolate the selective information generated in the second stage of the process, as distinct from the initial selective information. Consider composable processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ ,  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ , and  $w'' : \mu'' \mapsto \mu'''$ , with selective entropies  $S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[-U \log U]$ ,  $S'_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}'[-U' \log U']$ , and  $S''_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}''[-U'' \log U'']$ , respectively. Write the secondary selective change of selective entropy as  $\partial'_{\text{NS}} S'_{\text{NS}} := \text{cov}'(-U' \log U', U') = \mathbb{E}'[(-U' \log U')(U' - 1)]$ . The Strong Second Law of Natural Selection (Theorem 12.3) ensures that  $\partial'_{\text{NS}} S'_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}'(U') \log(\text{var}'(U') + 1)$ , with saturation in the case that  $w'$  is in selective equilibrium. We improve upon this by incorporating multi-level information. Define the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}'_w[Y] := \langle Y \rangle_w U$  and conditional covariance  $\text{cov}_w(Y, Y') := \mathbb{E}'_w[YY'] - \mathbb{E}'_w[Y]\mathbb{E}'_w[Y']$ .

The multi-level Price equation (Theorem 7.1) ensures that

$$\partial'_{\text{NS}} S'_{\text{NS}} = \text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[-U' \log U'], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}_w(-U' \log U', U')] \quad (14.1)$$

$$\partial'_{\text{EC}}(S'_{\text{NS}}, S''_{\text{NS}}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_{w'}(-U' \log U', -U'' \log U'')U']] \quad (14.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(S'_{\text{NS}}, S''_{\text{NS}}) &= \text{cov}(\mathbb{E}'_w[-U' \log U'], \mathbb{E}'_w[U']) + \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}_w(-U' \log U', U')] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[\Delta_{w'}(-U' \log U', -U'' \log U'')U']]. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3)$$

The following identity allows us to relate variances at different levels.

**Lemma 14.1** (Multi-Level Variance Identity). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes. Then:

$$\text{var}'(U') = \text{var}(U^{(2)}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U')]. \quad (14.4)$$

*Proof.* We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}'(U') - \text{var}(U^{(2)}) &= \mathbb{E}'[(U')^2] - \mathbb{E}[(U^{(2)})^2] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[(U')^2] - (U^{(2)})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}'_w[(U')^2] - \mathbb{E}'_w[U']^2] = \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U')], \end{aligned} \quad (14.5)$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[U'] = 1 = \mathbb{E}[U^{(2)}]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}'_w[U'] = U^{(2)}$ , and  $\text{var}'_w(U') = \mathbb{E}'_w[(U')^2] - \mathbb{E}'_w[U']^2 = \mathbb{E}'_w[(U')^2] - (U^{(2)})^2$ .  $\square$

By applying the Second Law (Theorem 12.3) and the multi-level variance identity (14.4), we have the following multi-level version of the Second Law.

**Theorem 14.2** (Multi-Level Second Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  and  $w'$  be composable processes. Then:

$$\partial'_{\text{NS}} S'_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}'(U') \log(1 + \text{var}'(U')) \quad (14.6)$$

$$= -(\text{var}(U^{(2)}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U')]) \log(1 + \text{var}(U^{(2)}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}'_w(U')]) \quad (14.7)$$

which is saturated when  $w'$  is in selective equilibrium ( $U'$  is constant  $\mu'_*$ -a.s.).

*Proof.* (14.6) and the saturation condition follows from the Second Law (Theorem 12.3) applied to the process  $w'$ . (14.7) follows from the variance identity (14.4).  $\square$

## 15. QUANTUM SELECTIVE ENTROPY

Recall the quantum formalism of Section 9. Consider a quantum evolutionary process  $\mathcal{W} : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ , with quantum relative fitness operator  $U := \frac{1}{W} \mathcal{W}^\dagger(\text{Id}')$ . Define the selective entropy operator  $-U \log U$  using the spectral theorem. We say that  $\mathcal{W}$  is finite entropy if  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[|U \log U|] = \text{Tr}(|U \log U| \mu) < \infty$ . Define the quantum selective entropy

$$S_{\text{NS}} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[-U \log U] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}((-U \log U) \mu) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\mu(-U \log U)). \quad (15.1)$$

Write  $\pi_* = \pi_{U \neq 0} = \text{Id} - \pi_{U=0}$  for the projection onto the childbearing subspace, orthogonal to the null space of  $U$ . Write the childbearing population  $\mu_* = \pi_* \mu$ , and the childbearing proportion  $p_* := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\pi_*] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\pi_* \mu) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\mu_*)$ .

**Theorem 15.1** (Strong Quantum Gibb's Inequality). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a finite-entropy quantum evolutionary process. Then:

$$-\log(1 + \text{var}_\mu(U)) \leq S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log p_*, \quad (15.2)$$

with saturation in the quantum selective-equilibrium case (in which case  $S_{\text{NS}} = \log p_* = -\log(1 + \text{var}_\mu(U))$ ).

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Theorem 11.4, *mutatis mutandis*. We have  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[X] = (1 - p_*)\mathbb{E}_0[X] + p_*\mathbb{E}_*[X]$ . For the upper bound, we use quantum Jensen's inequality:  $S_{\text{NS}} = p_*\mathbb{E}_*[-U \log U] \leq -p_*\mathbb{E}_*[U] \log \mathbb{E}_*[U] = \log p_* \leq 0$ . This is saturated when  $U$  is constant  $\mu_*$ -a.s., i.e., quantum selective equilibrium.

For the lower bound, we use quantum Jensen's inequality:  $S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}_\mu[U(-\log U)] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}((- \log U) \mu U) \geq -\log\left(\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(U \mu U)\right) = -\log \mathbb{E}_\mu[U^2]$ . This is saturated when  $U$  is constant  $\mu U$ -a.s. Since  $\mu U$  and  $\mu_*$  have the same null subspace, this is equivalent to quantum selective equilibrium.  $\square$

15.1. **Quantum Second Law.** Define the selective change of quantum selective entropy:  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} := \text{cov}_{\mu}(-U \log U, U) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(-U \log U)(U - 1)]$ .

**Theorem 15.2** (Strong Second Law of Quantum Selection). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a quantum evolutionary process with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[|U^2 \log U|] < \infty$ . Then

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}(U) \log(1 + \text{var}(U)) \leq \text{var}(U) S_{\text{NS}} \leq (e^{-S_{\text{NS}}} - 1) S_{\text{NS}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{p_*} - 1\right) \log p_* \leq 0, \quad (15.3)$$

with saturation of all but the last inequality in the quantum selective-equilibrium case.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Theorem 12.3, *mutatis mutandis*. We write  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[-U^2 \log U] - S_{\text{NS}}$ . We control the first term with quantum Jensen's inequality (Lemma 9.8):  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[U(-U \log U)] \leq -\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[U^2] \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[U^2] = -(1 + \text{var}_{\mu}(U)) \log(1 + \text{var}_{\mu}(U))$ . We use the strong lower bound for  $S_{\text{NS}}$  for the upper bound:  $-S_{\text{NS}} \leq \log(1 + \text{var}_{\mu}(U))$ . Combining these terms we have the result. The other inequalities follow by applying different versions of the strong bounds for  $S_{\text{NS}}$ . Saturation holds when  $U$  is constant  $U$ -a.s., i.e., quantum selective equilibrium.  $\square$

**Theorem 15.3** (Upper Bound for Quantum Selective Acceleration). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a quantum process for which  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[|(U - 1)^2 U \log U|] < \infty$ . Then:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 \leq 0, \quad (15.4)$$

with saturation of the first inequality exactly in the quantum purely environmental case (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} = 0$ ), or in the quantum selective-equilibrium case with  $p_* = 1/2$  (in which case  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} = -2 \log 4 \approx -1.204$ ). In all other cases,  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} < -\frac{1}{2} \text{var}(U)^2 \log \text{var}(U)^2 < 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Theorem 12.7, *mutatis mutandis*. We use quantum Jensen's inequality (Lemma 9.8):  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} = \text{var}_{\mu}(U) \frac{1}{\text{var}_{\mu}(U)} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(U - 1)^2 (-U \log U)] \leq -\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(U - 1)^2 U] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(U - 1)^2 U]}{\text{var}_{\mu}(U)}$ . We again use Jensen's inequality to compute  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[(U - 1)^2 U] \geq (\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[U^2] - 1)^2 = \text{var}_{\mu}(U)^2$ . Since  $(x, y) \mapsto -x \log y$  is decreasing in each argument, we have:  $\partial_{\text{NS}}^2 S_{\text{NS}} \leq -\text{var}_{\mu}(U)^2 \log \text{var}_{\mu}(U)$ . Saturation holds when  $U$  is constant  $(U - 1)^2$ -a.s.  $\square$

### Part 3. Environmental Entropy (One-Step Kolmogorov-Sinai Entropy)

#### 16. DEFINITIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENTROPY AND TOTAL ENTROPY

In this section, we introduce *environmental entropy*  $S_{\text{EC}}$  to measure environmental effects along a process, defined as the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy of the environmental part of the process. Unlike the selective entropy, the environmental entropy is defined by measuring local redistributions between pairs of sets. We then take the sum over any partition, and define the general environmental entropy as the supremum of this quantity over all partitions.

Let  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$  be measurable sets. We define the *local fitness function* from  $A$  to  $B$  by restricting the process to parent set  $A$  and child set  $B$ :

$$W_{A,B}(i) := 1_A(i) w_i(B) \quad (16.1)$$

That is,  $W_{A,B}(i)$  is the number of children of an individual  $i$  of parent set  $A$  who are members of child set  $B$ . Note that  $W_{A,B} \leq W$ . We define the *local relative fitness* (LRF) by dividing the local fitness by the selective coefficient:

$$U_{A,B}(i) := 1_A(i) \frac{w_i(B)}{\bar{W}} \geq 0. \quad (16.2)$$

Note that  $U_{A,B}(i) \leq U(i)$ . Write the average LRF as  $\bar{U}_{A,B} = \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]$ .

The LRF decomposes the relative fitness into four local pieces:

$$U = U_{I,I'} = U_{A,B} + U_{A^c,B} + U_{A,B^c} + U_{A^c,B^c}. \quad (16.3)$$

We define *environmental entropy* as a one-step version of the familiar Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy from probability and dynamical systems. This is defined locally relative to parent and child sets; partitionally relative to countable, measurable partitions; and generally by taking suprema over all partitions.

**Definition 16.1** (Environmental Entropy). Let  $w : \mu \rightarrow \mu'$  be an evolutionary process.

- (1) Consider measurable sets  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ . We define the *local environmental entropy* from  $A$  to  $B$  as:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) := -\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} \geq 0. \quad (16.4)$$

- (2) Consider countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $I$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I'$ . We define the *partition environmental entropy* from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  as:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} (-\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B}) \geq 0. \quad (16.5)$$

- (3) We define the *general environmental entropy* from  $\mu$  to  $\mu'$  as:

$$S_{\text{EC}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} (-\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B}) \geq 0, \quad (16.6)$$

where the supremum is over all countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $I$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I'$ .

The environmental entropy functionals are non-negative. To see this, note that  $U_{A,B} \leq U$ , hence  $\bar{U}_{A,B} \leq 1$  and so  $-\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} \geq 0$ . Sinai's Theorem (Theorem 16.4) ensures this supremum can be realized for a certain pair of partitions.

**Lemma 16.2.** For measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ :  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$  if and only if  $A \cap w^{-1}B = I$  or  $\emptyset$ . For countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I$  and  $I'$ :  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 0$  if and only if  $A \cap w^{-1}B = I$  for a single pair  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* If  $A \cap w^{-1}B = I$ , then  $U_{A,B} = U$  a.s. and  $\bar{U}_{A,B} = 1$ , so  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ . If  $A \cap w^{-1}B = \emptyset$ , then  $U_{A,B} = 0$  a.s. and  $\bar{U}_{A,B} = 0$ , so  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ . If  $A \cap w^{-1}B$  is non-empty and  $\neq I$ , then  $U_{A,B} \in (0, U)$ , and so  $\bar{U}_{A,B} \in (0, 1)$  and  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) > 0$ .

If  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 0$ , then  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$  for all  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , and only one of these pairs can satisfy  $A \cap w^{-1}B = I$ . If  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) > 0$ , then  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) > 0$  for some  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . For that pair, at least one of  $U_{A^c,B}$ ,  $U_{A,B^c}$ , and  $U_{A^c,B^c}$  must be positive. Let  $(A', B') \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  be another pair such that  $U_{A',B'} > 0$ , then  $S_{\text{EC}}(A', B') > 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 16.3** (Kolmogorov-Sinai Entropy). The environmental entropy is a ‘‘one step’’ form of Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy, which is instead optimized over all iterates of a process. To see this formally, let  $w^t : \mu^{t-1} \mapsto \mu^t$  be a family of composable evolutionary processes on the spaces  $I^t$ . Classically, the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy is defined by iterating a single process  $w$  on a static state space. Let  $w^{(T)} : \mu \mapsto \mu^T$  be the  $T$ -step iterated process  $w^{(T)} := w^T \circ \dots \circ w^1$  from  $I^0$  to  $I^T$ . Let  $w^{-(T)} : \mathcal{I}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^0$  be the  $T$ -step parent-set mapping. Define the  $T$ -step

selective coefficient  $\overline{W}^{(T)} := \overline{W}^1 \cdots \overline{W}^T = \frac{N^T}{N}$ . Define the  $T$ -step local relative fitness for  $i \in I^0$ ,

$$U_{A^0, \dots, A^T}(i) := 1_{A^0 \cap w^{-1}A^1 \cap w^{-(2)}A^2 \dots \cap w^{-(T)}A^T}(i) \frac{w_i^{(T)}(A^T)}{\overline{W}^{(T)}}. \quad (16.7)$$

The Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy is the supremum over  $T$ -step environmental entropies:

$$S_{\text{KS}} := \sup_{T \geq 1} \sup_{A^0, \dots, A^T} \sum_{(A^0, \dots, A^T) \in \mathcal{A}^0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}^T} (-\mathbb{E}[U_{A^0, \dots, A^T}] \log \mathbb{E}[U_{A^0, \dots, A^T}]) \geq S_{\text{EC}}, \quad (16.8)$$

where the first supremum is over natural numbers  $T \geq 1$ , the second supremum is over countable, measurable partitions  $A^0, \dots, A^T$  of  $I^0, \dots, I^T$ , and the sum is over partition sets. We have  $S_{\text{KS}} = S_{\text{EC}}$  if each  $T$ -step environmental entropy is at most the 1-step environmental entropy, otherwise  $S_{\text{KS}} \geq S_{\text{EC}}$ . The Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy is an invariant of a sequence of processes (i.e.,  $S_{\text{KS}}(w, w^2, \dots) = S_{\text{KS}}(w^2, w^3, \dots)$ ).

**16.1. Generalized Sinai's Theorem.** Recall Sinai's classic theorem [Sin59], which states that Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy on a static space is realized by a *generating partition*, a single countable, measurable partition  $\mathcal{A}_*$  which realizes (16.8). We state a generalized version of Sinai's theorem for environmental entropy, allowing for generating joint partitions which realize environmental entropy and generalized Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy.

**Theorem 16.4** (Generalized Sinai's Theorem). (One-Step) Let  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  be an evolutionary process. There exist countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}_*$  of  $I$  and  $\mathcal{B}_*$  of  $I'$  so that

$$S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*). \quad (16.9)$$

A joint partition  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating if and only if  $\mathcal{I}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing sets  $A \cap w^{-1}B$  for  $A \in \mathcal{A}_*, B \in \mathcal{B}_*$ .

(Iterated) Let  $w$  be an evolutionary process on the same space  $I$ . There exists a countable, measurable partition  $\mathcal{A}_*$  of  $I$  such that

$$S_{\text{KS}} = \sup_{T \geq 1} \sum_{A^0, \dots, A^T \in \mathcal{A}_*} (-\mathbb{E}[U_{A^0, \dots, A^T}] \log \mathbb{E}[U_{A^0, \dots, A^T}]) \quad (16.10)$$

We prove both forms of Sinai's theorem in Appendix B. Our argument generalizes the proofs of [LM17, Theorems 5,6] and [Dow11, Section 1.7] from the classical Sinai's theorem.

**16.2. Local Selective Entropy.** Recall the definition of selective entropy  $S_{\text{NS}} = \mathbb{E}[-U \log U]$  from Part 2. For any measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ , we define local selective entropy  $S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) := \mathbb{E}[-U_{A,B} \log U]$ . For any countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , the partition selective entropy equals the general selective entropy:  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = S_{\text{NS}}$ . This follows from additivity:  $\sum_{A,B} S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = \mathbb{E}[-\sum_{A,B} U_{A,B} \log U] = S_{\text{NS}}$  since  $\sum_{A,B} U_{A,B} = U$ .

**Definition 16.5.** We say that  $w$  is locally purely selective from  $A$  to  $B$  when local environmental entropy vanishes ( $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ ), meaning  $A \cap w^{-1}B = \emptyset$  or  $I$  by Lemma 16.2. We say that  $w$  is locally purely environmental from  $A$  to  $B$  when  $U = 1$   $\mu$ -a.s. on  $A \cap w^{-1}B$ .

**Lemma 16.6** (Non-Positivity of Local Selective Entropy). For any measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ , the local selective entropy is non-positive:

$$S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) \leq 0. \quad (16.11)$$

This is saturated exactly when  $w$  is locally purely environmental from  $A$  to  $B$ .

We prove Lemma 16.6 in Appendix C. The proof involves the completeness identity (16.3).

**16.3. Total Entropy.** We define the total entropy as the sum of selective entropy and environmental entropy. Total entropy can be negative or positive, depending on whether the process is “more selective” or “more environmental”.

**Definition 16.7** (Total Entropy). The total entropy of a process is defined as the sum of the selective entropy and environmental entropy at each level. For each  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ , we define local total entropy:

$$S_{\text{tot}}(A, B) := S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) + S_{\text{EC}}(A, B). \quad (16.12)$$

For each countable, measurable  $A$  of  $I$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I'$ , we define partition total entropy:

$$S_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := S_{\text{NS}} + S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}); \quad (16.13)$$

and general total entropy:

$$S_{\text{tot}} := S_{\text{NS}} + S_{\text{EC}}. \quad (16.14)$$

**Corollary 16.8.**

- $w$  is locally purely environmental from  $A$  to  $B$  iff  $S_{\text{tot}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) \geq 0$ .
- $w$  is locally purely selective from  $A$  to  $B$  iff  $S_{\text{tot}}(A, B) = S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) \leq 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $w$  is purely environmental, so that  $U = 1$  almost surely. Then  $S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log 1] = 0$ , so  $S_{\text{tot}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) \geq 0$ . Conversely, if  $S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = 0$ , then  $w$  is locally purely environmental.

Suppose that  $w$  is purely selective. Then  $w_i(B) = 1_B(i)W(i)$  for any measurable  $B$  and a.e.  $i$ , so  $U_{A,B} = 1_{A \cap B}(i)U(i)$ . In that case,  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = \mathbb{E}[-1_{A \cap B}U \log 1_{A \cap B}]$ . If  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ , then  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ . If  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\log 1_{A \cap B} = 0$  on the set  $A \cap B$ , so  $S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ . Consequently,  $S_{\text{tot}} = S_{\text{NS}} \leq 0$ .  $\square$

## 17. DISPERSION ENTROPY AND MIXING ENTROPY

In this section, we introduce dispersion entropy, which represents the “spreading” of a process, and mixing entropy, which represents the “coalescing” of a process. Both these entropies are non-negative, and we show that environmental entropy decomposes as the sum of dispersion and mixing entropies. We also present strong bounds on these entropies.

We introduce dispersion and mixing coefficients  $D_{A,B}$  and  $M_{A,B}$  to help us quantify dispersive and mixing effects. The dispersion coefficient is the ratio of local relative fitness  $U_{A,B}$  to total relative fitness  $U$ , measuring how much dispersion from set  $A$  to  $B$ . The mixing coefficient is further normalized by  $\overline{U}_{A,B}$ .

**Definition 17.1** (Dispersion and Mixing Coefficients). Consider measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I$ . Define the *dispersion coefficient* from  $A$  to  $B$  as the ratio of local relative fitness to relative fitness:

$$D_{A,B}(i) := \frac{U_{A,B}(i)}{U(i)} = \frac{W_{A,B}(i)}{W(i)} = \frac{1_A(i)w_i(B)}{w_i(I')}, \quad (17.1)$$

and the *mixing coefficient* from  $A$  to  $B$  by normalizing by the average local relative fitness:

$$M_{A,B}(i) := \frac{D_{A,B}(i)}{\overline{U}_{A,B}} = \frac{U_{A,B}(i)}{\overline{U}_{A,B}U(i)} = \frac{W_{A,B}(i)}{\overline{U}_{A,B}W(i)} = \frac{1_A(i)w_i(B)}{\overline{U}_{A,B}w_i(I')}. \quad (17.2)$$

These coefficients satisfy the bounds  $D_{A,B} \in [0, 1]$  and  $M_{A,B} \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}}\right]$ . When we average over the intermediate population, we have:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}] = \bar{U}_{A,B} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}] = 1. \quad (17.3)$$

When we average over the initial population, we have the non-reduced  $\mathbb{E}[D_{A,B}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{U_{A,B}}{\bar{U}}\right]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[M_{A,B}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[D_{A,B}]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{U_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}\bar{U}}\right]$ .

**17.1. Definitions of Dispersion and Mixing Entropies.** Dispersion entropy is the amount of environmental entropy generated by asexual or clonal reproduction, i.e., dispersion of an individual type. Mixing entropy is the amount of environmental entropy generated by sexual reproduction, i.e., mixing of two distinct types. The dispersion and mixing entropies are non-negative (Lemma 17.4), and their sum is environmental entropy (Proposition 17.5). Write  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y] = \mathbb{E}[UY]$  for the intermediate expectation.

**Definition 17.2** (Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process.

- (1) Consider measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq I'$ . Define the *local dispersion entropy* from  $A$  to  $B$  as:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) := \mathbb{E}[-U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[-D_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}] \geq 0, \quad (17.4)$$

and the *local mixing entropy* from  $A$  to  $B$  as:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) := \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}] = \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}] \geq 0. \quad (17.5)$$

- (2) Consider countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I$  and  $I'$ . Define the *partition dispersion entropy* from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  by summing over partition sets:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = \sum_{A, B} \mathbb{E}[-U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}] \geq 0, \quad (17.6)$$

and *partition mixing entropy* from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  by:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = \sum_{A, B} \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}] \geq 0. \quad (17.7)$$

- (3) Define the *general dispersion entropy* by taking the supremum over all countable, measurable partitions:

$$S_{\text{dis}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A, B} \mathbb{E}[-U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}] \geq 0, \quad (17.8)$$

and general mixing entropy:

$$S_{\text{mix}} := \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A, B} \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}] \geq 0. \quad (17.9)$$

The extreme processes are those which exhibit only purely dispersive or purely mixing effects. We quantify those as when the dispersion or mixing coefficients are constant.

**Definition 17.3** (Purely Dispersive and Purely Mixing Processes). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process.

- (1) We say that  $w$  is *locally purely dispersive* (resp. *locally purely mixing*) from  $A$  to  $B$  when  $D_{A,B}(i) \in \{0, 1\}$  (resp.  $M_{A,B}(i) \in \{0, 1\}$ ) for  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost every  $i$ .

- (2) We say that  $w$  is *partition purely dispersive* (resp. *partition purely mixing*) from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  when for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $w$  is locally purely dispersive (resp. locally purely mixing) from  $A$  to  $B$ .
- (3) We say that  $w$  is *generally purely dispersive* (resp. *generally purely mixing*) when it is partition purely dispersive (resp. partition purely mixing) for all countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I$  and  $I'$ , respectively.

**Lemma 17.4** (Non-Negativity of Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy.

- (1) The dispersion entropy functionals are non-negative:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) \geq 0, \quad S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{dis}} \geq 0, \quad (17.10)$$

and vanish when  $w$  is locally, partition, or generally purely mixing, respectively.

- (2) The mixing entropy functionals are non-negative:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \geq 0, \quad S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{mix}} \geq 0, \quad (17.11)$$

and vanish when  $w$  is locally, partition, or generally purely dispersive, respectively.

*Proof.* Non-negativity of dispersive entropy is trivial since  $U_{A,B} \leq U$  hence  $D_{A,B} \leq 1$ , and so  $-D_{A,B} \log D_{A,B} \geq 0$  a.s. Saturation holds ( $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = 0$ ) iff  $D_{A,B}(i) \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s., i.e., the purely mixing case. Non-negativity of mixing entropy follows from Jensen's inequality since  $x \log x$  is convex:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = \overline{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B} \geq \overline{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}] \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}]] = 0, \quad (17.12)$$

with saturation when  $M_{A,B}$  is constant a.s. on the weighted measure  $M_{A,B} \tilde{\mu}$ . Saturation holds ( $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = 0$ ) iff  $M_{A,B}(i) \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s., i.e., the purely dispersive case.  $\square$

**17.2. Environmental Entropy Decomposition.** We now decompose the environmental entropy into dispersion and mixing components, with no additional factors.

**Proposition 17.5** (Environmental Entropy Decomposition, Local and Partition Versions). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process.

- (1) Let  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ . Local environmental entropy from  $A$  to  $B$  decomposes as:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) + S_{\text{mix}}(A, B). \quad (17.13)$$

- (2) Consider countable, measurable partitions  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $I$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I'$ . Partition environmental entropy from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  decomposes as:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}). \quad (17.14)$$

*Proof.* When we average the pointwise identity  $-\overline{U}_{A,B} \log \overline{U}_{A,B} = -\overline{U}_{A,B} \log D_{A,B} + \overline{U}_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}$ , we have the local identity (17.13).  $\square$

For the general case, we need a variant of Sinai's theorem which allows us to use the same generating partitions for  $S_{\text{dis}}$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}$  as with  $S_{\text{EC}}$ .

**Theorem 17.6** (Generalized Sinai's Theorem for Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). A joint partition  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating for  $S_{\text{EC}}$  iff it is generating for both  $S_{\text{dis}}$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}$ . That is,

$$S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) \text{ if and only if } S_{\text{dis}} = S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) \text{ and } S_{\text{mix}} = S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*). \quad (17.15)$$

We prove Theorem 17.6 in Appendix D. The proof of Theorem 17.6 depends on the partition identity (17.14).

**Theorem 17.7** (Environmental Entropy Decomposition, General Version). General environmental entropy decomposes as:

$$S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}}. \quad (17.16)$$

*Proof.* For the general result (17.16), let  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  denote a generating joint partition for environmental, dispersion, and mixing entropies simultaneously, using Theorem 17.6. We evaluate the partition identity (17.14) at the generating partitions, hence

$$S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) + S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}}. \quad (17.17)$$

□

Both dispersion and environmental entropies are bounded above by environmental entropy, by non-negativity (Lemma 17.4) and the environmental decomposition (Proposition 17.5).

**Corollary 17.8** (Environmental Upper Bound for Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The dispersion entropy functionals are bounded by environmental entropy:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) \leq S_{\text{EC}}(A, B), \quad S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{dis}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}, \quad (17.18)$$

with saturation when  $w$  is locally, partition, or generally purely dispersive, respectively.

The mixing entropy functionals are bounded by environmental entropy:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \leq S_{\text{EC}}(A, B), \quad S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{mix}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}, \quad (17.19)$$

with saturation when  $w$  is locally, partition, or generally purely mixing, respectively.

**17.3. Bernoulli Examples.** We illustrate the extreme cases of dispersion and mixing via simple examples based on Bernoulli random variables. The Bernoulli dispersion process as the simple one-to-two mapping splitting population from one point onto two points, which has positive dispersion entropy. The Bernoulli mixing process is the simple two-to-one mapping combining population from two points onto one point, which has positive mixing entropy.

**Example 17.9** (Bernoulli Dispersive Process). Define  $I := \{0\}$  and  $I' := \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $q \in [0, 1]$ , and define the discrete measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  by  $\mu(0) := 1$ ,  $\mu'(0) := q$ , and  $\mu'(1) := 1 - q$ . Define the Bernoulli dispersion process by  $w_0(0) := q$  and  $w_0(1) := 1 - q$ . Then  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ . We have  $\overline{W} = 1$ . Note that  $W_{0,0}(0) = q$  and  $W_{0,1}(0) = 1 - q$ , and hence  $W(0) = 1$ . Thus dispersion entropy is non-zero:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(0, 0) = -q \log q \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{dis}}(0, 1) = -(1 - q) \log(1 - q), \quad (17.20)$$

representing dispersive effects. Since there is only one originating point 0, the local fitnesses have the same values:  $\overline{W}_{0,0} = q$  and  $\overline{W}_{0,1} = 1 - q$ . Hence the environmental entropy equals the dispersion entropy,  $S_{\text{EC}}(0, 0) = -q \log q = S_{\text{dis}}(0, 0)$  and  $S_{\text{EC}}(0, 1) = -(1 - q) \log(1 - q) = S_{\text{dis}}(0, 1)$ . Consequently, mixing entropy vanishes:  $S_{\text{mix}}(0, 0) = 0 = S_{\text{mix}}(0, 1)$ .

**Example 17.10** (Bernoulli Mixing Process). Define  $I := \{0, 1\}$  and  $I' := \{0\}$ . Let  $p \in [0, 1]$ , and define the measures  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  by  $\mu(0) := p$ ,  $\mu(1) := 1 - p$ , and  $\mu'(0) = 1$ . Define the Bernoulli mixing process by  $w_0(0) := 1$  and  $w_1(0) := 1$ . Then  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ . We have  $\overline{W} = 1$ . Note that  $W_{0,0}(0) = 1$  and  $W_{1,0}(1) = 1$ , and so  $W(0) = 1$  and  $W(1) = 1$ . Thus dispersion entropy vanishes:  $S_{\text{EC}}(0, 0) = \mathbb{E}[-W_{0,0}/W \log W_{0,0}/W] = p * 0 = 0$  and  $S_{\text{EC}}(1, 0) = \mathbb{E}[-W_{1,0}/W \log W_{1,0}/W] = (1 - p) * 0 = 0$ . Note that  $\overline{W}_{0,0} = p$  and  $\overline{W}_{1,0} = 1 - p$ . Hence environmental entropy equals mixing entropy:  $S_{\text{EC}}(0, 0) = -p \log p = S_{\text{mix}}(0, 0)$  and  $S_{\text{EC}}(1, 0) = -(1 - p) \log(1 - p) = S_{\text{mix}}(1, 0)$ .

The Bernoulli dispersion and coalescent processes are inverses of each other:  $w_{\text{mix}} \circ w_{\text{dis}}$  is the identity on measures on  $\{0\}$ , and  $w_{\text{dis}} \circ w_{\text{mix}}$  is the identity on measures on  $\{0, 1\}$ .

## 18. VANISHING ENTROPIES: EFFICIENCY, CONSISTENCY, REVERSIBILITY, AND IRREVERSIBILITY

In this section, we relate the vanishing of dispersive, mixing, and environmental entropies to concepts of left, right and full invertibility, respectively.

**Theorem 18.1** (Efficiency Theorem). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The following are equivalent:

- (1)  $w$  is purely mixing (i.e.,  $D_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ),
- (2)  $S_{\text{dis}} = 0$ ,
- (3) There exists a purely-environmental section to  $w_{\text{EC}}$ , i.e., a right-inverse process  $w' : \mu' \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$  (i.e.,  $w_{\text{EC}} \circ w' = 1_{\mu'}$ ). If  $S_{\text{mix}} > 0$ , then  $w'$  is not unique.

**Theorem 18.2** (Consistency Theorem). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The following are equiv.:

- (1)  $w$  is purely dispersive (i.e.,  $M_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ),
- (2)  $S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ ,
- (3) There exists a unique purely-environmental retraction to  $w_{\text{EC}}$ , i.e., a left-inverse process  $w'_{\text{EC}} : \mu' \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$  (i.e.,  $w'_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{EC}} = 1_{\tilde{\mu}}$ ).

**Theorem 18.3** (Reversibility Theorem). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The following are equiv.:

- (1)  $w$  is purely dispersive and purely mixing (i.e.,  $\{D_{A,B}, M_{A,B}\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ),
- (2)  $S_{\text{EC}} = 0$ ,
- (3) There exists a unique purely-environmental inverse process  $w'_{\text{EC}} : \mu' \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$  (i.e.,  $w'_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{EC}} = 1_{\mu'}$  and  $w_{\text{EC}} \circ w'_{\text{EC}} = 1_{\tilde{\mu}}$ ).

**Theorem 18.4** (Irreversibility Theorem). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The following are equiv.:

- (1)  $w$  exhibits dispersive or mixing effects (or both),
- (2)  $S_{\text{EC}} > 0$ ,
- (3)  $S_{\text{dis}} > 0$  or  $S_{\text{mix}} > 0$  (or both)
- (4) There does not exist a purely-environmental inverse process  $w'_{\text{EC}} : \mu' \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$  (i.e., every purely environmental process  $w' : \mu \mapsto \tilde{\mu}$  must satisfy  $w' \circ w_{\text{EC}} \neq 1_{\tilde{\mu}}$  or  $w_{\text{EC}} \circ w' \neq 1_{\mu'}$ ).

We prove Theorems 18.1 through 18.4 in Appendix E. To do so, we define a unique “child-set mapping”  $\chi$ , show partial invertibility of  $\chi$  for purely dispersive or mixing processes, then define the partial inverse process such that  $\chi$  is its parent-set mapping.

**Example 18.5.** The Bernoulli dispersion process (Example 17.9) is purely dispersive but not purely mixing, with left-inverse given by mapping both child types back to the single parent type. The Bernoulli coalescent process (Example 17.10) is purely mixing but not purely dispersive, with right-inverses given by mapping the child to any mix of parent types.

A process generated by a function  $f : I \rightarrow I'$  is purely mixing, and is reversible if and only if  $f$  is an invertible function.

**18.1. Dollo’s Law of Irreversibility.** The above results provide a mathematical framework for reasoning around reversibility and irreversibility. In the biology literature, a notable example is Dollo’s law of irreversibility, which states that “an organism never returns exactly to a former state, even if it finds itself placed in conditions of existence identical to those

in which it has previously lived ... it always keeps some trace of the intermediate stages through which it has passed" [Dol93, Gou70].

Dollo's result is an empirical observation without mathematical proof, and in fact researchers have documented exceptions to Dollo's law [CM08]. Nonetheless Dollo's observation illustrates that there are strong restrictions on biologically reversible processes. We state and prove a weak form of Dollo's law as Corollary 18.6, by combining the above theorems with a simple fact about selective reversibility. We do not explore a strong formalization of Dollo's law as he stated above, an investigation which is more empirical in nature.

Observe that a purely selective process can always be reversed to restore the childbearing population, but never the childless population. The selective inverse  $w_{\text{NS}}^{-1} : \tilde{\mu} \mapsto \mu_*$  is defined by scaling by the reverse fitness  $\frac{1}{\tilde{W}}$ , and is an inverse to the restricted selective process  $w_{\text{NS}|W>0} : \mu_* \mapsto \tilde{\mu}$ . Formally, define  $w_{\text{NS}}^{-1} : \tilde{\mu} \mapsto \mu_*$  by  $w_{\text{NS},\tilde{i}}^{-1}(di) := \frac{1}{\tilde{W}(\tilde{i})} \delta_{i,\tilde{i}}$ . Then  $w_{\text{NS}}^{-1}$  is an inverse to the restricted process  $w_{\text{NS}|W>0} : \mu_* \mapsto \tilde{\mu}$ . Thus  $w$  is selectively reversible if and only if  $p_* = 1$ , i.e.,  $\mu_* = \mu$ .

We say that  $w : \mu \rightarrow \mu'$  is *fully reversible* if there exists  $w^{-1} : \mu' \mapsto \mu$  such that  $w^{-1} \circ w = 1_\mu$  and  $w \circ w^{-1} = 1_{\mu'}$ . We say that  $w$  is *childbearing reversible* if we may invert  $w$  up to the childbearing population, i.e., if there exists  $w^{-1} : \mu' \mapsto \mu_*$  such that  $w^{-1} \circ w|_{\mu_*} = 1_{\mu_*}$  and  $w \circ w^{-1} = 1_{\mu'}$ . We say that  $w$  is *environmentally reversible* if  $0 = S_{\text{dis}} = S_{\text{mix}} = S_{\text{EC}}$ .

**Corollary 18.6** (Weak Version of Dollo's Law of Irreversibility). Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. Then:

- (1)  $w$  is childbearing reversible if and only if  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is environmentally reversible.
- (2)  $w$  is fully reversible if and only if  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is environmentally reversible and  $p_* = 1$ .

In both cases, the inverse process is defined by  $w^{-1} := w_{\text{NS}}^{-1} \circ w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger$ . The inverse admits the Price representation  $w^{-1} = \widehat{w}_{\text{EC}} \circ \widehat{w}_{\text{NS}}$ , with selective part  $\widehat{w}_{\text{NS}} : \mu' \mapsto \widehat{W}\mu'$  given by scaling  $\widehat{W}(i') := \int \frac{1}{\tilde{W}(\tilde{i})} w_{\text{EC},i'}^{-1}(d\tilde{i})$ , and environmental part  $\widehat{w}_{\text{EC}} : \widehat{W}\mu' \mapsto \mu_*$  given by  $\widehat{w}_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}'}(A) := \frac{1}{\widehat{W}(\tilde{i}')} w_{\tilde{i}'}^{-1}(A) = \int_A \frac{1}{\tilde{W}(\tilde{i})\widehat{W}(\tilde{i}')} w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}'}^{-1}(d\tilde{i})$ .

*Proof.* If  $w_{\text{EC}}$  is environmentally reversible, then it is straightforward that  $w^{-1} := (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}})^{-1} = w_{\text{NS}}^{-1} \circ w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger$  is an inverse.

Conversely, if  $w$  is childbearing reversible, then  $w$  is childbearing reversible, then define  $w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger := w_{\text{NS}} \circ w^{-1}$ . We first verify  $w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger = w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}} \circ w^{-1} = w \circ w^{-1} = 1_{\mu'}$  as desired. Next we verify that  $w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger \circ w_{\text{EC}} \circ w_{\text{NS}} = w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger \circ w = w_{\text{NS}} \circ w^{-1} \circ w = w_{\text{NS}}$ . Since  $w_{\text{NS}}$  is childbearing reversible, we apply the inverse  $w_{\text{NS}}^{-1}$  on the right and thus  $w_{\text{EC}}^\dagger \circ w_{\text{EC}} = 1_{\tilde{\mu}}$ .  $\square$

## 19. ENVIRONMENTAL EQUILIBRIUM AND BOUNDS ON DISPERSION AND MIXING ENTROPIES

In this section, we present strong bounds for dispersive and mixing entropies, improving upon Corollary 17.8. The bounds of that corollary are "weak", as they are only saturated in the extreme cases of purely dispersive and purely mixing processes. The saturation of the strong bounds here corresponds to the case of "environmental equilibrium", which represents an efficient flow between the parent and child populations.

19.1. **Environmental Equilibrium.** Observe that  $U_{A,B} > 0$  if and only if  $M_{A,B} > 0$ . Define the transmission proportion

$$\tilde{p}_{A,B} := \frac{\tilde{\mu}(U_{A,B} > 0)}{N'} = \frac{\tilde{\mu}(M_{A,B} > 0)}{N'} = \frac{\tilde{\mu}(1_A > 0 \text{ and } w_i(B) > 0)}{N'} = \frac{N'_{A,B}}{N'}, \quad (19.1)$$

which describes the proportion of the full intermediate population which both starts in  $A$  and ends in  $B$ . We have  $\tilde{p}_{I,I'} = 1$  by definition. We also have

$$\tilde{p}_{A,B} = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[1_{A,B}] \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[1_{A,B}D_{A,B}] = \bar{U}_{A,B}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \leq 1. \quad (19.2)$$

**Definition 19.1** (Environmental Equilibrium). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process. We say that  $w$  is in *environmental equilibrium* if for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ , both  $D_{A,B}$  and  $M_{A,B}$  are  $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -almost surely constant, that is,

$$D_{A,B} \in \left\{0, \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}\right\} \text{ and } M_{A,B}(i) \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}\right\} \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}\text{-almost every } i. \quad (19.3)$$

Note: if either the dispersion or mixing condition of (19.3) is satisfied then both are.

The class of processes in environmental equilibrium includes the purely dispersive and purely mixing cases (Lemma 19.2). In general, there exist environmental-equilibrium processes which exhibit both dispersive and mixing effects (Example 19.7).

**Lemma 19.2.** A purely dispersive or purely mixing process is in environmental equilibrium.

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ . If  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = 0$ , then  $D_{A,B} = 0$  or  $1$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely. In that case,  $\bar{U}_{A,B} = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}] = \tilde{p}_{A,B}$ . Thus  $M_{A,B} = 0$  or  $\frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely.

If  $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = 0$ , then  $M_{A,B} = 0$  or  $1$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely. In that case,  $1 = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}] = \tilde{p}_{A,B}$ , and so  $M_{A,B} = 0$  or  $1 = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely.  $\square$

**Lemma 19.3.** If  $\tilde{p}_{A,B} = 0$ , then  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $\tilde{p}_{A,B} = 0$ , then  $U_{A,B} = 0$  on a set of full  $\tilde{\mu}$ -measure, as well as  $\mu$ -measure.  $\square$

**Example 19.4** (Reversible Transmitting Processes). The converse of Lemma 19.3 does not hold. E.g., consider a process generated by an invertible function  $f : I \rightarrow I'$  with  $w = f_*$  given by the push-forward of measures, i.e.,  $\mu' := f_*\mu := \mu \circ f^{-1}$ . Since  $f$  is invertible,  $w$  is reversible by the Reversibility Theorem (Theorem 18.3) and so  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) = 0$ . However for any set  $B$  of positive  $\mu'$ -measure, we have  $\tilde{p}_{f^{-1}B, B} = 1$ .

19.2. **Strong Bounds on Dispersion and Mixing Entropies.** We present strong bounds on the dispersion and mixing entropies, by restricting expectations to the sets  $A \cap w^{-1}B$  and using Jensen's inequality. These are saturated in environmental equilibrium.

**Theorem 19.5** (Strong Bounds on Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). Let  $w$  be a finite-variance process, and let  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  be a generating joint partition. Then:

$$0 \leq \sum_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]} \leq S_{\text{dis}} \leq \sum_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}, \quad (19.4)$$

and

$$0 \leq \sum_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \leq S_{\text{mix}} \leq \sum_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}, \quad (19.5)$$

where the sums are over sets  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A}_* \times \mathcal{B}_*$  from the generating joint partition. The inner inequalities are saturated when  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium.

The outer upper (resp. lower) bound of (19.4) and outer lower (resp. upper) bound of (19.5) are saturated if and only if  $w$  is purely dispersive (resp. mixing).

*Proof.* Fix  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ . We first prove local versions of the strong bounds:

$$0 \leq \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]} \leq S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) \leq \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}(A, B), \quad (19.6)$$

and

$$0 \leq \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \leq S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \leq \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \leq S_{\text{EC}}(A, B). \quad (19.7)$$

with saturation of the inner inequalities when  $w$  is in local environmental equilibrium (i.e.,  $M_{A,B} \in \{0, \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}\}$   $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -a.s.).

We prove the inner mixing inequalities first. Observe that we can write mixing entropy as a negative weighted selective entropy  $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = -\bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[-M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}]$ , so we can apply the strong bounds of Theorem 11.4 apply to  $\mathbb{E}[-M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}]$ :

$$-\log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[-M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}] \leq -\log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}. \quad (19.8)$$

Multiplying by  $-\bar{U}_{A,B}$  and flipping the order of inequalities yields (19.7). The lower (resp. upper) bound of that result becomes the upper (resp. lower) bound of (19.7).

Saturation holds when  $M_{A,B}$  is  $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. constant on the set where it is positive, i.e., when  $M_{A,B} \in \{0, \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}\}$ . By Lemma 19.2, condition  $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B)$  also corresponds to the environmental equilibrium case.

The non-zero lower bound is trivial:  $\log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \geq 0$ . For the mixing upper bound, observe:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] - 1 = \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{U_{A,B}^2}{U} \right] - 1 \leq \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2} \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}] - 1 = \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} - 1, \quad (19.9)$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[X] = \mathbb{E}[UX]$  and  $U_{A,B} \leq U$ . Consequently,  $\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B)$ , which proves the outer mixing inequalities.

The local dispersion inequalities and saturation conditions follow by the relation  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) - S_{\text{mix}}(A, B)$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) &= S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) - S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \geq -\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \\ &= -\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2} = \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}, \end{aligned} \quad (19.10)$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2}$ , proving the local dispersion bounds (19.6). The general bounds (19.4) and (19.5) follow by summing over partition sets of the generating joint partition.

We have that  $w$  is purely dispersive ( $W_{A,B} = W$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s.) if and only if  $\tilde{p}_{A,B} = \frac{1}{N\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\mu}(W_{A,B} > 0) = \frac{1}{N\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\mu}(W > 0) = 1$ . Similarly,  $w$  is purely mixing ( $M_{A,B} = 1$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s.) if and only if  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] = 1$ . This proves the saturation conditions of the outer inequalities.  $\square$

**19.3. Examples in Environmental Equilibrium and Non-Equilibrium.** We demonstrate examples of equilibrium and non-equilibrium processes. We show that the class of discrete processes is always in environmental equilibrium, covering the extent of Price's work. For example, a process from two points to two points (a "Bernoulli equilibrium process") is in equilibrium, while exhibiting both dispersion and mixing effects. We present an example of a process on the real line which is non-equilibrium.

**Proposition 19.6** (Discrete Processes Are In Equilibrium). Let  $I$  and  $I'$  be countable sets (possibly infinite). Let  $\mu = (\mu_i)$  and  $\mu' = (\mu'_{i'})$  be discrete measures on  $I$  and  $I'$  respectively. Let  $w = (w_i(i'))$  an evolutionary process such that  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ , i.e., satisfying the linear equation  $\mu'_{i'} = \sum_i w_i(i')\mu_i$  for each  $i' \in I'$ . Write the population sizes  $N := |\mu| = \mu(I) = \sum_i \mu_i$  and  $N' := |\mu'| = \mu'(I') = \sum_{i'} \mu'_{i'}$ , and the selective coefficient  $\bar{W} = \frac{N'}{N}$ .

The Price representation theorem (Theorem 4.4) ensures that there exists a diagonal matrix  $w_{\text{NS}} = (W(i))$  and a stochastic matrix  $w_{\text{EC}} = \left(\frac{w_i(i')}{W(i)}\right)$  such that  $w = w_{\text{EC}}w_{\text{NS}}$ , in the sense of matrix multiplication. Let  $\tilde{\mu} = w_{\text{NS}}\mu = W\mu$  be the fitness-scaled parent population.

For each  $(i, i') \in I \times I'$ , the average local relative fitness and transmission proportion are:

$$\bar{U}_{i,i'} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{W_{i,i'}}{\bar{W}} \right] = \frac{1}{N'} w_i(i') \mu_i \quad (19.11)$$

$$\tilde{p}_{i,i'} := \frac{1}{N'} \tilde{\mu}(W_{i,i'} > 0) = \frac{1}{N'} 1_{W_{i,i'} > 0} W(i) \mu_i. \quad (19.12)$$

The dispersion and mixing coefficients equal:

$$D_{i,i'}(i) := \frac{W_{i,i'}(i)}{W(i)} = \frac{w_i(i')}{W(i)} = \frac{\bar{U}_{i,i'}}{\tilde{p}_{i,i'}} \quad (19.13)$$

$$M_{i,i'}(i) := \frac{W_{i,i'}(i)}{\bar{U}_{i,i'} W(i)} = \frac{w_i(i')}{\bar{U}_{i,i'} W(i)} = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{i,i'}} \quad (19.14)$$

for  $i'$  such that  $w_i(i') > 0$  (otherwise  $D_{i,i'}(i) := 0 =: M_{i,i'}(i)$  if  $w_i(i') = 0$ ), and  $D_{i,i'}(j) = 0 = M_{i,i'}(j)$  for  $j \neq i$ . Thus  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium. The entropy functionals satisfy:

$$\sum_{i,i'} \bar{U}_{i,i'} \log \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[D_{i,i'}^2]} = S_{\text{dis}} = \sum_{i,i'} \bar{U}_{i,i'} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{i,i'}}{\bar{U}_{i,i'}} \quad (19.15)$$

and

$$\sum_{i,i'} \bar{U}_{i,i'} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{i,i'}} = S_{\text{mix}} = \sum_{i,i'} \bar{U}_{i,i'} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_{i,i'}^2]}{\bar{U}_{i,i'}}. \quad (19.16)$$

with  $S_{\text{dis}} = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}} = \sum_{i,i'} (-\bar{U}_{i,i'} \log \bar{U}_{i,i'})$ .

*Proof.* The discrete joint partition of  $I$  and  $I'$  is a generating joint partition, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is the minimal  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all sets of the form  $\{i\} \cap w^{-1}(\{i'\})$ . Formally, the discrete joint partition is the joint collection of singletons ( $\{i\}, \{i'\}$ ). Thus it suffices to evaluate functionals at singleton pairs. Since  $D_{i,i'}(i) = \frac{\bar{U}_{i,i'}}{\tilde{p}_{i,i'}}$  or  $= 0$ ,  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium. Theorem 19.5 ensures that the relations for  $S_{\text{dis}}$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}$  are satisfied.  $\square$

**Corollary 19.7** (Bernoulli Equilibrium Process). Define  $I = \{0, 1\}$  and  $I' = \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  be measures on  $I$  and  $I'$ , respectively. Any process  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  is in environmental equilibrium. If  $w_i(i') > 0$  for all  $(i, i') \in I \times I'$ , then  $w$  exhibits dispersive and mixing effects.

We next present an example of a process not in environmental equilibrium. By Proposition 19.6, any non-equilibrium process must be non-discrete. We describe diffusion processes on continuous sets like the circle or real line, where there are “very small” sets.

**Example 19.8** (Diffusion Processes Are Non-Equilibrium). Consider the two-point set  $I := \{0, 1\}$  with uniform mass  $\mu(0) = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(1)$ , and the unit interval  $I' := [0, 1]$  equipped with Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$ . For each  $i \in I$ , define the process  $w_i := \lambda$ , i.e., each  $i$  diffuses its full mass uniformly onto the interval. The child measure is uniform measure but as a result of the mixture:  $\mu'(B) := (w_*\mu)(B) = \sum_i w_i(B)\frac{1}{2} = \lambda(B)$ . Note that  $w$  is purely environmental since  $W(i) := w_i(I') = \lambda(I') = 1 = \overline{W}$ .

Write the local fitness  $W_{i,B}(i) := w_i(B) = \lambda(B) = U_{i,B}$  and  $W_{i,B}(1-i) := 0$ . The dispersion coefficient is given by  $D_{i,B}(i) := \frac{W_{i,B}(i)}{W(i)} = \lambda(B)$ . The average local relative fitness equals  $\overline{U}_{i,B} = \mathbb{E}[W_{i,B}] = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(B)$  and the transmission proportion equals  $\tilde{p}_{i,B} := \mu(W_{i,B} > 0) = 1$  when  $\lambda(B) > 0$ . Consequently,  $D_{i,B} = \lambda(B) < \frac{1}{2}\lambda(B) = \frac{\overline{U}_{i,B}}{\tilde{p}_{i,B}}$ . Since this holds for any measurable  $B$  of positive Lebesgue measure, and since any partition must include sets of positive Lebesgue measure, the process is not in equilibrium.

## 20. SELECTIVE CHANGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENTROPY AND THE THIRD LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION

We analyze the selective change of environmental entropies. The Weak Law shows that in environmental equilibrium, the selective changes vanish, i.e., selection in equilibrium processes does not have environmental externalities. The Strong Law provides quantitative bounds, and the selective changes may fluctuate positively or negatively depending on interactions between selective and environmental niches.

Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process, and let  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  be a generating joint partition, as in Section 16. We define the selective change of the environmental entropy functionals:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}} = \sum \text{cov}(-U_{A,B} \log \overline{U}_{A,B}, U) \quad (20.1)$$

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}} = \sum \text{cov}(-U_{A,B} \log \overline{D}_{A,B}, U) \quad (20.2)$$

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}} = \sum \text{cov}(U_{A,B} \log \overline{M}_{A,B}, U), \quad (20.3)$$

where the sums are over partition sets in the generating joint partition  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A}_* \times \mathcal{B}_*$ . Linearity and Theorem 17.7 ensure the following:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}} = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}} + \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}. \quad (20.4)$$

The Weak Third Law ensures that these quantities vanish in environmental equilibrium, i.e., when  $D_{A,B}$  and  $M_{A,B}$  are constant  $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -almost surely. The converse need not be true.

**Theorem 20.1** (Weak Third Law of Natural Selection). If  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium, then

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}} = 0 = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}} = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}. \quad (20.5)$$

and

$$S'_{\text{EC}} - S_{\text{EC}} = \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}), \quad S'_{\text{dis}} - S_{\text{dis}} = \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{dis}}, S'_{\text{dis}}), \quad S'_{\text{mix}} - S_{\text{mix}} = \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{mix}}, S'_{\text{mix}}). \quad (20.6)$$

*Proof.* If  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium, then  $D_{A,B}$  and  $M_{A,B}$  are  $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -almost surely constant. We rewrite the selective changes in terms of the measure  $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{dis}} &= \sum \text{cov}(-U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}, U) = \sum \mathbb{E}[(-U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B})(U - 1)] \\ &= \sum \tilde{p}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[(-D_{A,B} \log D_{A,B})(U - 1)] \\ &= \sum \tilde{p}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[(-\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[D_{A,B}] \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[D_{A,B}])(U - 1)] = 0,\end{aligned}\quad (20.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{mix}} &= \sum \text{cov}(U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}, U) = \sum \mathbb{E}[(U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B})(U - 1)] \\ &= \sum \tilde{p}_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[(M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B})(U - 1)] \\ &= \sum \tilde{p}_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[(\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[M_{A,B}] \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[M_{A,B}])(U - 1)] = 0.\end{aligned}\quad (20.8)$$

By linearity,  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{EC}} = \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{dis}} + \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ . The Price equation implies (20.6).  $\square$

We strengthen this result by showing that non-equilibrium processes can fluctuate, with the fluctuation windows collapsing in environmental equilibrium. We introduce some selective-fluctuation coefficients to define the windows.

**Definition 20.2** (Selective Fluctuation Coefficients). Let  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ . Define the local selective fluctuation coefficients:

$$\varphi_{A,B} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U] = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \mathbb{E}[1_{A,B}U^2] = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \mathbb{E}[(U_{A,B} + U_{A,B}^c)^2] \quad (20.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{A,B} &:= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}] = \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U_{A,B}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \mathbb{E}[UU_{A,B}] = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}(U_{A,B} + U_{A,B}^c)],\end{aligned}\quad (20.10)$$

$$\gamma_{A,B} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}^2] = \bar{U}_{A,B}^2 \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}^2] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}\left[\frac{U_{A,B}^2}{U}\right] = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}^2] \quad (20.11)$$

**Lemma 20.3.** For any  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ :

$$\gamma_{A,B} \leq \lambda_{A,B} \leq \varphi_{A,B}, \quad (20.12)$$

with saturation when  $w$  is purely dispersive from  $A$  to  $B$ .

*Proof.* Since  $U_{A,B}(i) \leq U(i)$  for all  $i$ , we have  $D_{A,B}(i)^2 \leq D_{A,B}(i) \leq 1$  which proves (20.12).

For saturation, observe that  $\lambda_{A,B} = \varphi_{A,B}$  if and only if  $D_{A,B} = 1$   $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -a.s., i.e., the purely dispersive case. We have  $\gamma_{A,B} = \lambda_{A,B}$  if and only if  $D_{A,B}^2 = D_{A,B}$   $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -a.s., which is equivalent to  $D_{A,B} = 1$  (since  $D_{A,B} > 0$   $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ -a.s.), i.e., the purely dispersive case.  $\square$

**Theorem 20.4** (Strong Third Law of Natural Selection). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process, and let  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  be a generating joint partition. Then:

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\gamma_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{dis}} \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\varphi_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]} \right), \quad (20.13)$$

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{mix}} \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}} \right), \quad (20.14)$$

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\lambda_{A,B}^2}{\gamma_{A,B} \varphi_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^3} \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}} \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\varphi_{A,B} \gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}^2 \bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{p}_{A,B} \mathbb{E}[D_{A,B}^2]} \right), \quad (20.15)$$

where the sums are over partition sets  $A \in \mathcal{A}_*$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_*$ . These inequalities are saturated when  $w$  is in environmental equilibrium.

The bounds in (20.13) (resp. (20.14), (20.15)) vanish if and only if  $w$  is purely dispersive (resp. mixing, reversible).

We prove the Strong Third Law in Appendix F. We do so by splitting each selective change into two terms, then controlling with Jensen's inequality using the measure  $\tilde{\mu}_{A,B}$ .

## 21. ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENTROPY

Consider composable processes  $w : \mu \mapsto \mu'$  and  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \mu''$ , with generating joint partitions  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}'_*, \mathcal{C}_*)$ . Define the changes of the environmental entropy functionals:

$$\Delta(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}) := \sum \left( -\bar{U}'_{B',C} \log \bar{U}'_{B',C} \right) + \sum \bar{U}_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} \quad (21.1)$$

$$\Delta(S_{\text{dis}}, S'_{\text{dis}}) := \sum \mathbb{E}'[-U'_{B',C} \log D'_{B',C}] + \sum \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}] \quad (21.2)$$

$$\Delta(S_{\text{mix}}, S'_{\text{mix}}) := \sum \mathbb{E}'[U'_{B',C} \log M'_{B',C}] - \sum \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}], \quad (21.3)$$

where the sums are over the joint generating partitions  $(\mathcal{B}'_*, \mathcal{C}_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ , respectively.

The Price equation decomposes the changes into selective and environmental pieces:

$$\Delta(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}) = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}) \quad (21.4)$$

$$\Delta(S_{\text{dis}}, S'_{\text{dis}}) = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{dis}}, S'_{\text{dis}}) \quad (21.5)$$

$$\Delta(S_{\text{mix}}, S'_{\text{mix}}) = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}} + \partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{mix}}, S'_{\text{mix}}), \quad (21.6)$$

where the selective changes are as in Section 20, and the environmental changes are as follows:

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}) := \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \sum \left\langle -U'_{B',C} \log \bar{U}'_{B',C} \right\rangle_w + \sum U_{A,B} \log \bar{U}_{A,B} \right] \quad (21.7)$$

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{dis}}, S'_{\text{dis}}) := \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \sum \left\langle -U'_{B',C} \log D'_{B',C} \right\rangle_w + \sum U_{A,B} \log D_{A,B} \right] \quad (21.8)$$

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{mix}}, S'_{\text{mix}}) := \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \sum \left\langle U'_{B',C} \log M'_{B',C} \right\rangle_w - \sum U_{A,B} \log M_{A,B} \right], \quad (21.9)$$

where the sums are over generating joint partitions, and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[X] = \mathbb{E}[UX]$ .

**Proposition 21.1** (Intergenerational Environmental Change). *Let  $w$  be finite-entropy. The environmental change of environmental entropy can be written intergenerationally as follows:*

$$\partial_{\text{EC}}(S_{\text{EC}}, S'_{\text{EC}}) = - \sum_{A,B;B',C} \frac{\mathbb{E}[UU_{A,B}]}{\mathbb{E}[U^2]} \bar{U}'_{B',C} \log \frac{\bar{U}'_{B',C}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}}, \quad (21.10)$$

where the sum is over generating joint partition sets.

*Proof.* Each of the environmental changes (21.7)-(21.9) can be written in an intergenerational form for certain observables  $X_{A,B}$  and  $Y_{B',C}$ , and parameters  $\alpha_{A,B}$  and  $\beta_{B',C}$  satisfying

$\sum_{A,B} \alpha_{A,B} = 1 = \sum_{B',C} \beta_{B',C}$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pm \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \sum_{B',C} \langle -U'_{B',C} \log Y_{B',C} \rangle_w + \sum_{A,B} U_{A,B} \log X_{A,B} \right] \\
&= \pm \sum_{A,B;B',C} \alpha_{A,B} \beta_{B',C} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \left\langle -\frac{U'_{B',C}}{\beta_{B',C}} \log Y_{B',C} \right\rangle_w + \frac{U_{A,B}}{\alpha_{A,B}} \log X_{A,B} \right] \\
&= \pm \sum_{A,B;B',C} \alpha_{A,B} \beta_{B',C} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ \left\langle -\frac{U'_{B',C}}{\beta_{B',C}} \log \frac{Y_{B',C}}{X_{A,B}} - \left( \frac{U'_{B',C}}{\beta_{B',C}} - \frac{U_{A,B}}{\alpha_{A,B}} \right) \log X_{A,B} \right\rangle_w \right] \quad (21.11)
\end{aligned}$$

When we apply (21.11) with  $X_{A,B} = \bar{U}_{A,B}$ ,  $Y_{B',C} = \bar{U}'_{B',C}$ ,  $\alpha_{A,B} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U_{A,B}]}{\mathbb{E}[U]}$ , and  $\beta_{B',C} = \bar{U}'_{B',C}$ , then the second term vanishes, and the first term equals (21.10).  $\square$

**Remark 21.2.** If the reader needs bounds on the environmental change of dispersive and mixing entropies, then apply Jensen's inequality to representation (21.11).

## 22. MULTI-LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ENTROPY

We state the multi-level Price equation for the environmental entropy functionals, following Section 7. Let  $w$ ,  $w'$  and  $w''$  be composable processes, with joint generating partitions  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ ,  $(\mathcal{B}'_*, \mathcal{C}_*)$ , and  $(\mathcal{C}'_*, \mathcal{D}_*)$ , respectively. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(S'_{\text{EC}}, S''_{\text{EC}}) &= \text{cov} \left( \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ -\sum U'_{B',C} \log \bar{U}'_{B',C} \right], \mathbb{E}'_w[U'] \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{cov}_w \left( -\sum U'_{B',C} \log \bar{U}'_{B',C}, U' \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ \Delta_{w'} \left( -\sum U'_{B',C} \log \bar{U}'_{B',C}, -\sum U''_{C',D} \log \bar{U}''_{C',D} \right) U' \right] \right] \quad (22.1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(S'_{\text{dis}}, S''_{\text{dis}}) &= \text{cov} \left( \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ -\sum U'_{B',C} \log D'_{B',C} \right], \mathbb{E}'_w[U'] \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{cov}_w \left( -\sum U'_{B',C} \log D'_{B',C}, U' \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ \Delta_{w'} \left( -\sum U'_{B',C} \log D'_{B',C}, -\sum U''_{C',D} \log D''_{C',D} \right) U' \right] \right] \quad (22.2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(S'_{\text{mix}}, S''_{\text{mix}}) &= \text{cov} \left( \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ \sum U'_{B',C} \log M'_{B',C} \right], \mathbb{E}'_w[U'] \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{cov}_w \left( \sum U'_{B',C} \log M'_{B',C}, U' \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}'_w \left[ \Delta_{w'} \left( \sum U'_{B',C} \log M'_{B',C}, \sum U''_{C',D} \log M''_{C',D} \right) U' \right] \right] \quad (22.3)
\end{aligned}$$

with sums over joint generating partitions.

## 23. QUANTUM ENVIRONMENTAL ENTROPY

Recall the quantum formalism of Sections 9 and 15. Consider a quantum evolutionary process  $\mathcal{W} : \mu \mapsto \mu'$ , with quantum relative fitness operator  $U := \frac{1}{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{W}^\dagger (\text{Id}')$ .

**Definition 23.1.** A countable quantum partition is a representation of the identity operator into countably many projection operators. Formally, let  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi'$  denote the spaces of projection operators in the Hilbert spaces  $H$  and  $H'$ , respectively. We say  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Pi$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \Pi'$  are countable quantum partitions of  $H$  and  $H'$  if  $\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \pi = \text{Id}$  and  $\sum_{\pi' \in \mathcal{B}} \pi' = \text{Id}'$ .

For projection operators  $\pi \in \Pi$  and  $\pi' \in \Pi'$ , define local relative fitness by  $U_{\pi,\pi'} := (\mathcal{W}^\dagger \pi') \circ U \circ \pi$  and local density  $\mu_{\pi,\pi'} := (\mathcal{W}^\dagger \pi') \circ \mu \circ \mu$ . Average local relative fitness is given by  $\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[U_{\pi,\pi'}] = \text{Tr}(U_{\pi,\pi'} \mu)$ . Define quantum partition environmental entropy:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum \text{Tr}(-\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}), \quad (23.1)$$

where we sum over partition operators  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi' \in \mathcal{B}$ . Define the quantum environmental entropy by taking the suprema over countable quantum partitions:

$$S_{\text{EC}} := \sup S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sum \text{Tr}(-\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}). \quad (23.2)$$

**Conjecture 23.2.** We conjecture that a quantum version of Sinai's theorem holds, i.e., that  $S_{\text{EC}}$  be realized by a generating joint quantum partition  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This would likely satisfy a maximality relation like  $X = \sum_{\pi,\pi'} \text{Tr}(X \mathcal{W}^\dagger \pi' \otimes \pi) \mathcal{W}^\dagger \pi' \otimes \pi$  for any self-adjoint  $X$ .

We prove strong strong bounds for the partition entropies. Define dispersion and mixing operators  $D_{\pi,\pi'} := U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1}$  and  $M_{\pi,\pi'} := \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}} U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1}$ . Define partition dispersion and mixing entropies using the spectral theorem:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum \mathbb{E}_\mu[-U_{\pi,\pi'} \log D_{\pi,\pi'}] = \text{Tr}((-U_{\pi,\pi'} \log D_{\pi,\pi'}) \mu) \quad (23.3)$$

$$S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum \mathbb{E}_\mu[U_{\pi,\pi'} \log M_{\pi,\pi'}] = \text{Tr}((U_{\pi,\pi'} \log M_{\pi,\pi'}) \mu). \quad (23.4)$$

The environmental entropy decomposes as the sum of dispersion and mixing entropies:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}). \quad (23.5)$$

We say  $\mathcal{W}$  is partition purely dispersive (resp. mixing) if  $D_{\pi,\pi'}$  (resp.  $M_{\pi,\pi'}$ ) is  $\mu_*$ -a.s. constant. We say  $\mathcal{W}$  is in partition quantum environmental equilibrium if  $D_{\pi,\pi'}$  and  $M_{\pi,\pi'}$  are  $\mu_{\pi,\pi'}$ -a.s. constant.

**Conjecture 23.3.** We conjecture that vanishing quantum environmental (resp. dispersive, mixing) entropies correspond to fully (resp. left-, right-) invertible quantum processes.

The partition operation is a contraction, i.e.,  $U_{\pi,\pi'} \leq U$  in the ordering of self-adjoint operators. To see this, apply complete non-negativity of  $\mathcal{W}$  to the completeness identity:  $U = U_{\pi,\pi'} + U_{\pi,\text{Id}' - \pi'} + U_{\text{Id} - \pi, \pi'} + U_{\text{Id} - \pi, \text{Id}' - \pi'} \geq U_{\pi,\pi'}$ . Write the squares  $D_{\pi,\pi'}^2 := U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1} U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1}$  and  $M_{\pi,\pi'}^2 := \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}^2} D_{\pi,\pi'}^2 = \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}^2} U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1} U_{\pi,\pi'} U^{-1}$ . By contraction,  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\mu[D_{\pi,\pi'}^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu[D_{\pi,\pi'}] \leq 1$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\mu[M_{\pi,\pi'}^2] \leq \frac{1}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}^2} \mathbb{E}_\mu[M_{\pi,\pi'}] \leq 1$ .

**Theorem 23.4** (Strong Bounds on Quantum Partition Dispersion and Mixing Entropies). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a finite-entropy quantum process. For any joint quantum countable partition  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ :

$$0 \leq \sum_{\pi,\pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\mu[D_{\pi,\pi'}^2]} \leq S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \sum_{\pi,\pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{\pi,\pi'}}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \quad (23.6)$$

and

$$0 \leq \sum_{\pi,\pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{\pi,\pi'}} \leq S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \sum_{\pi,\pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'} \log \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\mu[M_{\pi,\pi'}^2]}{\bar{U}_{\pi,\pi'}} \leq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \quad (23.7)$$

where the sums are over partition operators  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi' \in \mathcal{B}$ . The inner inequalities are saturated when  $w$  is in partition quantum environmental equilibrium.

The outer upper (resp. lower) bound of (23.6) and outer lower (resp. upper) bound of (23.7) are saturated if and only if  $w$  is purely quantum dispersive (resp. mixing).

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 19.5, *mutatis mutandis*, using quantum Jensen's inequality (Lemma 9.8) and the left selective transformation  $\mathbb{E}_\mu^{\text{left}}[X] := \mathbb{E}_{W\mu}$ .  $\square$

Define the selective changes of the entropy functionals:

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \text{cov}_\mu(-U_{\pi, \pi'} \log \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}, U) \quad (23.8)$$

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \text{cov}_\mu(-U_{\pi, \pi'} \log D_{\pi, \pi'}, U) \quad (23.9)$$

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \text{cov}_\mu(U_{\pi, \pi'} \log M_{\pi, \pi'}, U). \quad (23.10)$$

**Proposition 23.5** (Weak Partition Third Law of Quantum Selection). If  $\mathcal{W}$  is in quantum environmental equilibrium, then for all joint quantum countable partitions  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ ,

$$\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 0 = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}). \quad (23.11)$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Proposition (20.1), *mutatis mutandis*.  $\square$

Write  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\pi, \pi'} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\mu_{\pi, \pi'}}$ . Define the quantum local selective fluctuation coefficients:

$$\varphi_{\pi, \pi'} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\pi, \pi'}[U] \quad (23.12)$$

$$\lambda_{\pi, \pi'} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\pi, \pi'}[D_{\pi, \pi'} U] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\pi, \pi'}[U_{\pi, \pi'}] \quad (23.13)$$

$$\gamma_{\pi, \pi'} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\pi, \pi'}[D_{\pi, \pi'}^2 U]. \quad (23.14)$$

For any  $\pi, \pi'$ ,

$$\gamma_{\pi, \pi'} \leq \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \leq \varphi_{\pi, \pi'}, \quad (23.15)$$

by a similar argument as Lemma 20.3 plus contractivity of  $U$ .

**Theorem 23.6** (Strong Partition Third Law of Quantum Selection). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy quantum process, and let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  be a joint quantum countable partition. Then:

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'}}{\gamma_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'}}{\bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}} \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\varphi_{\pi, \pi'}}{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}}{\mathbb{E}[D_{\pi, \pi'}^2]} \right), \quad (23.16)$$

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'}}{\varphi_{\pi, \pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{\pi, \pi'}^2] \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\gamma_{\pi, \pi'}}{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'}} \right), \quad (23.17)$$

$$\sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'}^2}{\gamma_{\pi, \pi'} \varphi_{\pi, \pi'} \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{\pi, \pi'}^2]}{\bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}^3} \right) \leq \partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \sum \left( \tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \lambda_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\varphi_{\pi, \pi'} \gamma_{\pi, \pi'}}{\lambda_{\pi, \pi'}^2 \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}} - \bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{\pi, \pi'}}{\tilde{p}_{\pi, \pi'} \mathbb{E}[D_{\pi, \pi'}^2]} \right) \quad (23.18)$$

where the sums are over partitions  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_*$  and  $\pi' \in \mathcal{B}_*$ . These inequalities are saturated when  $\mathcal{W}$  is in partition environmental equilibrium.

The bounds in (23.16) (resp. (23.17), (23.18)) vanish if and only if  $w$  is partition purely dispersive (resp. mixing, reversible).

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Theorem 20.4, *mutatis mutandis*.  $\square$

## 24. CONCLUSION

Price introduced his famous equation to describe all change in terms of fitnesses, covariances, and environmental terms. In Part 1, we derive a Price equation in measure-theoretic and quantum contexts. We prove Zeroth and First Laws of Natural Selection: selection increases and accelerates the pace of selection, minimizing selective effects only in the selective equilibrium case (life-or-death processes). Otherwise, selective effects accelerate over time.

We introduce selective entropy to further quantify selective effects, and we prove the Second Law to show how selection compounds selective effects. Processes in selective equilibrium satisfy identities instead of inequalities, and can be further studied analytically. Non-selective equilibrium processes compound selective effects exponentially beyond their equilibrium counterparts.

We introduce environmental entropy to quantify environmental effects, which decompose into dispersion and mixing pieces. The Weak Third Law shows that environmental-equilibrium processes have vanishing selective change of dispersion and mixing entropy functionals, while the Strong Third Law provides quantitative windows for these entropies to fluctuate within.

In the quantum case, two quantum Price equations hold, as do quantum versions of the Zeroth, First, and Second Laws. A partition version of the Third Law holds, and it is an open question whether the Third Law fully extends to the general quantum case.

We hope this article is helpful to mathematicians and scientists seeking to understand how selection and environmental change interact within evolutionary processes of interest.

## REFERENCES

- [AA18] Elliot G Aguilar and Erol Akçay. Gene-culture coinheritance of a behavioral trait. *The American Naturalist*, 192(3):311–320, 2018.
- [BCGG14] Charles JK Batty, Paul Crewe, Alan Grafen, and Richard Gratwick. Foundations of a Mathematical Theory of Darwinism. *Journal of mathematical biology*, 69(2):295–334, 2014.
- [Bel15] Jordan Bell. The symmetric difference metric. April 12, 2015. <https://individual.utoronto.ca/jordanbell/notes/symmetric-difference.pdf>.
- [BF21] Jake Brown and Jared M Field. The extended price equation: migration and sex. *bioRxiv*, 2021.
- [BHT20] Mapundi K Banda, Michael Herty, and Torsten Trimborn. Recent developments in controlled crowd dynamics. *Crowd Dynamics, Volume 2*, pages 133–157, 2020.
- [BL21] Lorenzo Baravalle and Victor J Luque. Towards a Pricean foundation for cultural evolutionary theory. *THEORIA. An Int'l Journal for Theory, History and Foundations of Science*, 2021.
- [Bog07] Vladimir I Bogachev. *Measure Theory*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [CCC+20] Jianshu Cao, Richard J Cogdell, David F Coker, Hong-Guang Duan, Jürgen Hauer, Ulrich Kleinekathöfer, Thomas LC Jansen, Tomáš Mančal, RJ Dwayne Miller, Jennifer P Ogilvie, et al. Quantum biology revisited. *Science Advances*, 6(14):eaaz4888, 2020.
- [CFS07] Arthur Charpentier, Jean-David Fermanian, and Olivier Scaillet. The estimation of copulas: Theory and practice. *Copulas: From theory to application in finance*, pages 35–64, 2007.
- [CM08] Rachel Collin and Maria Pia Miglietta. Reversing opinions on dollo’s law. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 23(11):602–609, 2008.
- [CN76] James F Crow and Thomas Nagylaki. The rate of change of a character correlated with fitness. *The American Naturalist*, 110(972):207–213, 1976.
- [dH08] Hans de Haan. The dynamics of functioning investigating societal transitions with partial differential equations. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 14(4):302–319, 2008.

- [DMGLP15] Anna De Masi, Antonio Galves, Eva Löcherbach, and Errico Presutti. Hydrodynamic limit for interacting neurons. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 158(4):866–902, 2015.
- [Dol93] Louis Dollo. The laws of evolution. *Bull. Soc. Bel. Geol. Paleontol*, 7:164–166, 1893.
- [Dow11] Tomasz Downarowicz. *Entropy in Dynamical Systems*. New Mathematical Monographs. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [DP06] Anna DeMasi and Errico Presutti. *Mathematical methods for hydrodynamic limits*. Springer, 2006.
- [FB20] Steven A Frank and Frank J Bruggeman. The fundamental equations of change in statistical ensembles and biological populations. *Entropy*, 22(12):1395, 2020.
- [Fis30] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. *The genetical theory of natural selection: a complete variorum edition*. Oxford University Press, 1930.
- [Fis58] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Ripol Classic, 1958.
- [Fol13] Gerald B Folland. *Real Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [Fox06] Jeremy W Fox. Using the price equation to partition the effects of biodiversity loss on ecosystem function. *Ecology*, 87(11):2687–2696, 2006.
- [FP00] Jan A Freund and Thorsten Pöschel. *Stochastic processes in physics, chemistry, and biology*, volume 557. Springer Science & Business Media, 2000.
- [Fra85] Steven A Frank. Hierarchical selection theory and sex ratios. ii. on applying the theory, and a test with fig wasps. *Evolution*, 39(5):949–964, 1985.
- [Fra86a] Steven A Frank. Dispersal polymorphisms in subdivided populations. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 122(3):303–309, 1986.
- [Fra86b] Steven A Frank. Hierarchical selection theory and sex ratios I. General solutions for structured populations. 1986.
- [Fra87] Steven A Frank. Demography and sex ratio in social spiders. *Evolution*, 41(6):1267–1281, 1987.
- [Fra92] Steven A Frank. A kin selection model for the evolution of virulence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 250(1329):195–197, 1992.
- [Fra95] Steven A Frank. George price’s contributions to evolutionary genetics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 175(3):373–388, 1995.
- [Fra97] Steven A Frank. The price equation, fisher’s fundamental theorem, kin selection, and causal analysis. *Evolution*, pages 1712–1729, 1997.
- [Fra09] Steven A Frank. Natural selection maximizes fisher information. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 22(2):231–244, 2009.
- [Fra12] Steven A Frank. Natural selection. iv. the price equation. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 25(6):1002–1019, 2012.
- [Fra15] Steven A Frank. d’alembert’s direct and inertial forces acting on populations: The price equation and the fundamental theorem of natural selection. *Entropy*, 17(10):7087–7100, 2015.
- [Fra18] Steven A Frank. The price equation program: simple invariances unify population dynamics, thermodynamics, probability, information and inference. *Entropy*, 20(12):978, 2018.
- [FS16] Daniel Friedman and Barry Sinervo. *Evolutionary games in natural, social, and virtual worlds*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [Gou70] Stephen Jay Gould. Dollo on dollo’s law: irreversibility and the status of evolutionary laws. *Journal of the History of Biology*, 3(2):189–212, 1970.
- [Gra85] Alan Grafen. A geometric view of relatedness. *Oxford surveys in evolutionary biology*, 2(2):28–89, 1985.
- [Gra00] Alan Grafen. Developments of the price equation and natural selection under uncertainty. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 267(1449):1223–1227, 2000.
- [Gra02] Alan Grafen. A first formal link between the price equation and an optimization program. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 217(1):75–91, 2002.
- [Gra07] Alan Grafen. The formal darwinism project: a mid-term report. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 20(4):1243–1254, 2007.
- [Gra15] Alan Grafen. Biological fitness and the fundamental theorem of natural selection. *The American Naturalist*, 186(1):1–14, 2015.
- [Gre09] T Ryan Gregory. Understanding natural selection: essential concepts and common misconceptions. *Evolution: Education and Outreach*, 2(2):156–175, 2009.

- [GSH<sup>+</sup>20] Shyamolina Ghosh, Lawrence W Sheppard, Mark T Holder, Terrance D Loecke, Philip C Reid, James D Bever, and Daniel C Reuman. Copulas and their potential for ecology. In *Advances in Ecological Research*, volume 62, pages 409–468. Elsevier, 2020.
- [Ham70] William D Hamilton. Selfish and spiteful behaviour in an evolutionary model. *Nature*, 228(5277):1218–1220, 1970.
- [Ham75] William D Hamilton. Innate social aptitudes of man: an approach from evolutionary genetics. *Biosocial anthropology*, 53:133–155, 1975.
- [Ham96] William Donald Hamilton. *Narrow Roads of Gene Land 1: Evolution of Social Behaviour*, volume 1. Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [Har11] Oren Harman. *The price of altruism: George Price and the search for the origins of kindness*. WW Norton & Company, 2011.
- [HL98] William D Hamilton and TM Lenton. Spora and gaia: how microbes fly with their clouds. *Ethology Ecology & Evolution*, 10(1):1–16, 1998.
- [HU10] Heikki Helanterä and Tobias Uller. The price equation and extended inheritance. *Philosophy & Theory in Biology*, 2, 2010.
- [Isa99] Rufus Isaacs. *Differential games: a mathematical theory with applications to warfare and pursuit, control and optimization*. Courier Corporation, 1999.
- [JEP<sup>+</sup>21] John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Židek, Anna Potapenko, et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- [KFL22] Franz Kuchling, Chris Fields, and Michael Levin. Metacognition as a consequence of competing evolutionary time scales. *Entropy*, 24(5):601, 2022.
- [KGS09] Benjamin Kerr and Peter Godfrey-Smith. Generalization of the price equation for evolutionary change. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution*, 63(2):531–536, 2009.
- [LaG13] Tom LaGatta. Continuous disintegrations of gaussian processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 57(1):151–162, 2013.
- [LB21] Victor J Luque and Lorenzo Baravalle. The mirror of physics: on how the price equation can unify evolutionary biology. *Synthese*, pages 1–24, 2021.
- [LCC<sup>+</sup>13] Neill Lambert, Yueh-Nan Chen, Yuan-Chung Cheng, Che-Ming Li, Guang-Yin Chen, and Franco Nori. Quantum biology. *Nature Physics*, 9(1):10–18, 2013.
- [Lei21] Tom Leinster. *Entropy and Diversity: The Axiomatic Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [Lew74] Richard C Lewontin. *The genetic basis of evolutionary change*, volume 560. Columbia University Press, 1974.
- [LH01] Michel Loreau and Andy Hector. Partitioning selection and complementarity in biodiversity experiments. *Nature*, 412(6842):72–76, 2001.
- [LJFR04] D Leao Jr, M Fragoso, and P Ruffino. Regular conditional probability, disintegration of probability and radon spaces. *Proyecciones (Antofagasta)*, 23(1):15–29, 2004.
- [LM17] François Le Maître. Notes on the kolmogorov-sinai theorem. 2017. <https://webusers.imj-prg.fr/~francois.le-maitre/gdt/KS.pdf>.
- [LOH20] Jussi Lehtonen, Samir Okasha, and Heikki Helanterä. Fifty years of the price equation, 2020.
- [LTL15] Andrew T Little, Joshua A Tucker, and Tom LaGatta. Elections, protest, and alternation of power. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(4):1142–1156, 2015.
- [LvO02] Timothy M Lenton and Marcel van Oijen. Gaia as a complex adaptive system. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 357(1421):683–695, 2002.
- [McC02] Peter McCullagh. What is a statistical model? *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(5):1225–1310, 2002.
- [Mic00] Richard E Michod. *Darwinian dynamics: evolutionary transitions in fitness and individuality*. Princeton University Press, 2000.
- [MPM17] Simon Milz, Felix A Pollock, and Kavan Modi. An introduction to operational quantum dynamics. *Open Systems & Information Dynamics*, 24(04):1740016, 2017.
- [NC02] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*, 2002.

- [NGPdCG20] Schuyler B Nicholson, Luis Pedro Garcia-Pintos, Adolfo del Campo, and Jason R Green. Time-information uncertainty relations in thermodynamics. *Nature Physics*, 16(12):1211–1215, 2020.
- [NH11] Martin Nowak and Roger Highfield. *Supercooperators: Altruism, evolution, and why we need each other to succeed*. Simon and Schuster, 2011.
- [Now14] Sebastian Nowozin. Optimal decisions from probabilistic models: the intersection-over-union case. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 548–555, 2014.
- [Plu06] Anya Plutynski. What was Fisher’s fundamental theorem of natural selection and what was it for? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C*, 37(1):59–82, 2006.
- [PN02] Karen M Page and Martin A Nowak. Unifying evolutionary dynamics. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 219(1):93–98, 2002.
- [Pri70] George R Price. Selection and covariance. *Nature*, 227:520–21, 1970.
- [Pri71a] George R Price. Extension of the hardy-weinberg law to assortative mating. *Annals of human genetics*, 34(4):455–458, 1971.
- [Pri71b] George R Price. The nature of selection. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 175(3):389–396, 1995, published posthumously, written circa 1971.
- [Pri72a] George R Price. Fisher’s ‘fundamental theorem’ made clear. *Annals of human genetics*, 36(2):129–140, a 1972.
- [Pri72b] George R Price. Extension of covariance selection mathematics. *Annals of human genetics*, 35(4):485–490, 1972.
- [PS72] George R. Price and Cedric A.B. Smith. Fisher’s malthusian parameter and reproductive value. *Annals of human genetics*, 36(1):1–7, 1972.
- [Rez91] Fraydoun Rezakhanlou. Hydrodynamic limit for attractive particle systems on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . *Communications in mathematical physics*, 140(3):417–448, 1991.
- [Ric08] Sean H Rice. A stochastic version of the price equation reveals the interplay of deterministic and stochastic processes in evolution. *BMC evolutionary biology*, 8(1):262, 2008.
- [Ric20] Sean H Rice. Universal rules for the interaction of selection and transmission in evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 375(1797):20190353, 2020.
- [RMB<sup>+</sup>21] Martha O Burford Reiskind, Michael L Moody, Daniel I Bolnick, Charles T Hanifin, and Caroline E Farrior. Nothing in evolution makes sense except in the light of biology. *BioScience*, 71(4):370–382, 2021.
- [Rob66] Alan Robertson. A mathematical model of the culling process in dairy cattle. *Animal Science*, 8(1):95–108, 1966.
- [Sam89] Hanan Samet. Hierarchical spatial data structures. In *Symposium on Large Spatial Databases*, pages 191–212. Springer, 1989.
- [SBdML17] Alastair Smith, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, and Tom LaGatta. Group incentives and rational voting. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 29(2):299–326, 2017.
- [Sca06] Enrico Scalas. The application of continuous-time random walks in finance and economics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 362(2):225–239, 2006.
- [Sch44] Erwin Schrödinger. What is life? the physical aspect of the living cell. *What is life? The physical aspect of the living cell.*, 1944.
- [Sim44] George G. Simpson. *Tempo and mode in evolution*. Number 15. Columbia Univ. Press, 1944.
- [Sin59] Yaha G Sinai. On the notion of entropy of a dynamical system. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR*, volume 124, page 768, 1959.
- [SP73] J Maynard Smith and George R Price. The logic of animal conflict. *Nature*, 246(5427):15–18, 1973.
- [Tak08] Leon Armenovich Takhtadzhian. *Quantum mechanics for mathematicians*, volume 95. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [TWAM20] Ami Taitelbaum, Robert West, Michael Assaf, and Mauro Mobilia. Population dynamics in a changing environment: random versus periodic switching. *Physical Review Letters*, 125(4):048105, 2020.
- [VC20] Sander Van Cranenburgh. Blending computer vision into discrete choice models. *preprint*, 2020.

- [WNHK21] Bob Week, Scott L Nuismer, Luke J Harmon, and Stephen M Krone. A white noise approach to evolutionary ecology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 521:110660, 2021.
- [WPGP+12] Christian Weedbrook, Stefano Pirandola, Raúl García-Patrón, Nicolas J Cerf, Timothy C Ralph, Jeffrey H Shapiro, and Seth Lloyd. Gaussian quantum information. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 84(2):621, 2012.
- [ZFG13] Can Zhou, Masami Fujiwara, and William E Grant. Dynamics of a predator–prey interaction with seasonal reproduction and continuous predation. *Ecological modelling*, 268:25–36, 2013.

## Appendices

### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF QUANTUM JENSEN'S INEQUALITY (LEMMA 9.8)

*Proof of Lemma 9.8.* By convexity, the tangent line to the real-valued  $f$  at  $\bar{X}$  is below the graph of  $f$ . Specifically, there exist real numbers  $a := f'(\bar{X})$  and  $b := f(\bar{X}) - f'(\bar{X})\bar{X}$  such that for all real  $x$ ,

$$ax + b \leq f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad a\bar{X} + b = f(\bar{X}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Consequently, with respect to the partial ordering of self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space, we have

$$f(X) \geq aX + b\text{Id}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

that is, the operator  $f(X) - aX - b\text{Id}$  is non-negative, where  $\text{Id}$  is the identity operator.<sup>1</sup>

We compute:

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X)] \geq \mathbb{E}_\mu[aX + b\text{Id}] = a\mathbb{E}_\mu[X] + b = a\bar{X} + b = f(\bar{X}) = f(\mathbb{E}_\mu[X]). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If  $X$  is  $\mu$ -a.s. constant (with  $X = \bar{X}\text{Id}$  a.s.), then the inequality (A.3) is saturated. If  $X$  is not  $\mu$ -a.s. constant, then for operator values away from  $\bar{X}$ ,  $f(X) > aX + b\text{Id}$ , and so (A.3) is a strict inequality.  $\square$

### APPENDIX B. PROOF OF GENERALIZED SINAI'S THEOREM (THEOREM 16.4)

*Proof of Theorem 16.4.* We prove the theorem by defining certain metrics on the space of joint partitions, show that they are complete, and use this to ensure the supremum is obtained. Define the space of countable, measurable joint partitions:

$$\mathcal{P} := \{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) : \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \text{ countable measurable partitions of } I, I', \text{ resp.}\}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Define a pseudo-metric on  $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}'$  using the symmetric difference:

$$d_1((A, B), (A', B')) := \mu(A \triangle A') + \mu'(B \triangle B'). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where  $X \triangle X' := (X \cup X') - (X \cap X')$ .

**Sublemma B.1.**  $d_1$  is a complete pseudo-metric on the space  $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}'$ .

*Proof.* See [Bog07, Thm 1.12.16] or [Bel15, Theorem 1] for proof of completeness.  $\square$

For any Cauchy sequence  $(A_n, B_n)$ , we write  $A_\infty := \lim_n A_n$  and  $B_\infty := \lim_n B_n$ . This extends to a complete pseudo-metric on the space  $\mathcal{P}$ . Indeed, define the partition difference metric as the minimal distance across all joint partition elements:

$$d_1((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')) := \min\{d_1((A, B), (A', B')) : (A, B; A', B') \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}' \times \mathcal{B}'\}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The limiting joint partitions are of the form

$$(\mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathcal{B}_\infty) := \{(A_\infty, B_\infty) : (A_n, B_n) \in (\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \text{ is a Cauchy sequence}\}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Define the conditional partition environmental entropy between two partitions as follows:

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{A}', B' \in \mathcal{B}'} \left( -\bar{U}_{A' \cap A, B' \cap B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A' \cap A, B' \cap B}}{\bar{U}_{A, B}} \right) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This represents the additional environmental entropy in  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  given that within  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .

<sup>1</sup>i.e., for all  $h$ ,  $\langle h, (f(X) - aX - b\text{Id})h \rangle \geq 0$ .

Observe that if  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  is a refinement of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  (i.e., all joint partition elements of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  can be written as unions of those in  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$ ), then

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}') = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \quad (\text{B.6})$$

meaning that environmental entropy is conserved under partition refinements.<sup>2</sup>In that case, the reverse conditional entropy vanishes:  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} | \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}') = 0$ .

We define the *environmental entropy metric* on  $\mathcal{P}$  between two joint partitions as the larger conditional entropy difference:

$$d_{\text{EC}}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')) := \max\{S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} | \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')\}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

If  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  is a refinement of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ , then

$$d_{\text{EC}}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')) = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

**Sublemma B.2.**  $d_{\text{EC}}$  is a coarsening of  $d_1$ , i.e., convergence in  $d_{\text{EC}}$  implies convergence in  $d_1$

*Proof.* See [LM17, Proposition 9] or [Dow11, Fact 1.7.7] for a proof of coarseness, which applies to our setting, *mutatis mutandis*.  $\square$

Sinai's theorem follows as a simple consequence. Let  $(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n)$  be a sequence of joint partitions such that  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \uparrow S_{\text{EC}}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that each joint partition refines the previous one. Thus  $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $d_{\text{EC}}$ , since

$$d_{\text{EC}}((\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n), (\mathcal{A}_{n'}, \mathcal{B}_{n'})) = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_{n'}, \mathcal{B}_{n'} | \mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \downarrow 0 \quad (\text{B.9})$$

as  $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$ , and therefore by  $d_1$ -convergence, there exists a limiting joint partition  $(\mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathcal{B}_\infty)$ , and that this joint partition is unique up to measure zero. This proves Sinai's theorem for environmental entropy.

For the iterated Sinai's theorem, observe that the above result gives a generating joint partition for each  $T$ -step iterated process. We then take coarsenings over all  $T$ -step processes, with convergence guaranteed by a similar argument as above.

We prove that a joint partition  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating if and only if  $\mathcal{I}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing sets  $A \cap w^{-1}B$  for  $A \in \mathcal{A}_*, B \in \mathcal{B}_*$ . Suppose  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating, and let  $\Gamma = \sigma(A \cap w^{-1}B)$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing sets  $A \cap w^{-1}B$ . Suppose  $\Gamma$  is strictly smaller than  $\mathcal{I}$ , i.e., there exists  $A' \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $A' \notin \Gamma$ , i.e.,  $A'$  cannot be written as a countable operation of sets  $A \cap w^{-1}B$ . Define a new refined partition  $\mathcal{A}'_*$  of sets of the form  $A' \cap A \cap w^{-1}B$  and  $(I - A') \cap A \cap w^{-1}B$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}'_*$  refines  $\mathcal{A}_*$ , the refined partition environmental entropy  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  equals the supremum  $S_{\text{EC}}$  and so  $(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating. Since the entropies are equal, we can write  $S_{\text{EC}}(A', B)$  as a combination  $\sum_A S_{\text{EC}}(A, B)$  for some partition sets  $A$ . However, since  $A' \notin \Gamma$ , we must have the strict relation  $A' \subset \bigcup A \cap w^{-1}B$ , thus  $\sum_A S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) > S_{\text{EC}}(A', B)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $\Gamma = \mathcal{I}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>Proof of (B.6). We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &= \sum_{A, B} \sum_{A', B'} \left( -\bar{U}_{A' \cap A, B' \cap B} \log \bar{U}_{A, B} - \bar{U}_{A' \cap A, B' \cap B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A' \cap A, B' \cap B}}{\bar{U}_{A, B}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{A', B'} (-\bar{U}_{A', B'} \log \bar{U}_{A', B'}) = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}'). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose  $\Gamma = \sigma(A \cap w^{-1}B)$  for a joint partition  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . If  $S_{\text{EC}} \geq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ , then there exists a refinement  $(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*)$  such that  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*) > S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ , so there exist sets  $A' \in \mathcal{A}'_*$ ,  $B' \in \mathcal{B}'_*$  such that  $A' \cap w^{-1}B' \notin \Gamma$ , a contradiction. Thus  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating.  $\square$

### APPENDIX C. PROOF OF NON-POSITIVITY OF LOCAL SELECTIVE ENTROPY (LEMMA 16.6)

Recall that  $S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = \mathbb{E}[U_{A,B} \log U]$ . We prove  $S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) \leq 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 16.6.* Define the local selective coefficient:  $\overline{W}_{A,B} := \overline{W}_{A,B} = \mathbb{E}[W_{A,B}] = \frac{1}{N} \int_A w_i(B) \mu(di)$ . Define the weighted local relative fitness by weighting the local fitness by  $\overline{W}_{A,B}$  instead of  $\overline{W}$ :

$$\widehat{U}_{A,B} := \frac{W_{A,B}}{\overline{W}_{A,B}} := \frac{\overline{W}}{\overline{W}_{A,B}} U_{A,B}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}_{A,B}] = 1$  by construction. We define the renormalized local selective entropy:

$$\widehat{S}_{\text{NS}}(A, B) := \mathbb{E}[-\widehat{U}_{A,B} \log \widehat{U}_{A,B}] \leq \mathbb{E}[-\widehat{U}_{A,B}] \log \mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}_{A,B}] = -1 \log 1 = 0. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Inequality (C.2) is saturated when  $\widehat{U}_{A,B} = 1$  almost surely.

We now rewrite local selective entropy in terms of the renormalized version:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{NS}}(A, B) &= \mathbb{E}[-U_{A,B} \log U] = \frac{\overline{W}_{A,B}}{\overline{W}} \mathbb{E}[-\widehat{U}_{A,B} \log U] \\ &= \frac{\overline{W}_{A,B}}{\overline{W}} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\widehat{U}_{A,B} \log \left( \widehat{U}_{A,B} + \widehat{U}_{A^c,B} + \widehat{U}_{A,B^c} + \widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\overline{W}_{A,B}}{\overline{W}} \left( \widehat{S}_{\text{NS}}(A, B) + \mathbb{E} \left[ -\widehat{U}_{A,B} \log \left( 1 + \frac{\widehat{U}_{A^c,B}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} + \frac{U_{A,B^c}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} + \frac{\widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} \right) \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where we decompose  $U = \widehat{U}_{A,B} + \widehat{U}_{A^c,B} + \widehat{U}_{A,B^c} + \widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c}$  using (16.3).

The first term is non-positive by (C.2). The second term is an integral of the form  $\mathbb{E}[-\widehat{U}_{A,B} \log(1+Y)]$ , where  $Y := \frac{\widehat{U}_{A^c,B}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} + \frac{U_{A,B^c}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} + \frac{\widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c}}{\widehat{U}_{A,B}} \geq 0$ . Since  $-\log(1+y) \leq 0$  for  $y \geq 0$ , the integral is bounded above by 0. This proves (16.11).

The first term vanishes when  $\widehat{U}_{A,B} = 1$  almost surely, and the second term vanishes when  $\widehat{U}_{A^c,B} = \widehat{U}_{A,B^c} = \widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c} = 0$  almost surely.

Saturation occurs when both  $\widehat{S}_{\text{NS}}(A, B) = 0$  and  $\widehat{U}_{A^c,B} = \widehat{U}_{A,B^c} = \widehat{U}_{A^c,B^c} = 0$ . The former means that  $\widehat{U}_{A,B} = 1$  a.s., and the latter means that  $\widehat{U}_{A,B} = U$  a.s. (by Lemma 16.2). This is equivalent to  $U = 1$  almost surely on  $A \cap w^{-1}B$ , i.e.,  $w$  is purely environmental from  $A$  to  $B$ .  $\square$

### APPENDIX D. PROOF OF GENERALIZED SINAI'S THEOREM FOR DISPERSION AND MIXING ENTROPIES (THEOREM 17.6)

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is a generating joint partition for environmental entropy:  $S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . We first show that  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating for dispersion entropy.

Recall the conditional environmental entropy from (B.5):

$$S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := - \sum_{A,B} \sum_{A',B'} \mathbb{E}[U_{A',B'}] \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[U_{A',B'}]}{\mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]} \geq 0. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Define the conditional dispersion entropy:

$$S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{A}', B' \in \mathcal{B}'} \mathbb{E} \left[ -U_{A',B'} \log \frac{U_{A',B'}}{U_{A,B}} \right] \geq 0. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sum_{A,B} \sum_{A',B'} \mathbb{E} \left[ U_{A,B} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[U_{A,B}]} \mathbb{E} \left[ U_{A,B} \frac{U_{A',B'}}{U_{A,B}} \log \frac{U_{A',B'}}{U_{A,B}} \right] \right] \leq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Recall the environmental entropy metric  $d_{\text{EC}}$  from (B.7):  $d_{\text{EC}} = d_{\text{EC}}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')) := \max\{S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} | \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')\}$ .

Define the dispersion entropy metric, which refines the environmental metric:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{dis}}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')) &:= \max\{S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' | \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} | \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')\} \\ &\leq d_{\text{EC}}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Consequently, any Cauchy sequence for  $d_{\text{EC}}$  is also a Cauchy sequence for  $d_{\text{dis}}$ , with the same limiting joint partition.

We next analyze the case of mixing entropy. Observe that by the algebraic identity (17.14), we have:

$$S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) - S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{EC}} - S_{\text{dis}}. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Suppose that  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  is any joint partition which improves upon the generating partition:  $S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) \geq S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$ . Define the refinements  $\mathcal{A}'_* := \mathcal{A}_* \wedge \mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{B}'_* := \mathcal{B}_* \wedge \mathcal{B}'$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*)$  is again a generating partition of  $S_{\text{EC}}$  and  $S_{\text{dis}}$ . Consequently,  $S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*) = S_{\text{EC}} - S_{\text{dis}} = S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This shows that no partition can strictly improve upon a generating partition, and so  $S_{\text{mix}} = S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This proves that  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating for mixing entropy, which proves the forward direction.

For the reverse direction, suppose that  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is a generating joint partition for both  $S_{\text{dis}}$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}$ . Consequently,  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{dis}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) + S_{\text{mix}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*) = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}}$ . Suppose  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  any joint partition which improves upon the generating partition:  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}') \geq S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . Define the refinements  $\mathcal{A}'_* := \mathcal{A}_* \wedge \mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{B}'_* := \mathcal{B}_* \wedge \mathcal{B}'$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*)$  is again a generating partition of  $S_{\text{dis}}$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}$ . Consequently,  $S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}'_*, \mathcal{B}'_*) = S_{\text{dis}} + S_{\text{mix}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This shows that no partition can strictly improve upon a generating partition, and so  $S_{\text{EC}} = S_{\text{EC}}(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$ . This proves that  $(\mathcal{A}_*, \mathcal{B}_*)$  is generating for environmental entropy.  $\square$

## APPENDIX E. PROOFS OF EFFICIENCY, CONSISTENCY, REVERSIBILITY, AND IRREVERSIBILITY THEOREMS (THEOREMS 18.1-18.4)

**E.1. The Child-Set Mapping.** Our principle technique is to show there exists a formal inverse  $\chi : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}'$  to the parent-set mapping  $w^{-1} : \mathcal{I}' \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ . We use this to define the inverse processes.

Let  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ . Define the restricted fitness functions

$$W_{A,B}(i) := 1_A(i)w_i(B) \quad \text{and} \quad W_A(i) := W_{A,I'}(i) = 1_A W(i), \quad (\text{E.1})$$

and the averaged process  $w_A(B) := \mathbb{N}\mathbb{E}[W_{A,B}] = \int_A w_i(B)\mu(di)$ .

**Definition E.1** (Child-Set Mappings). Let  $w$  be an evolutionary process. We define a *child-set mapping* of  $w$  to be a set function  $\chi : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}'$  satisfying the following two properties:

- (1) (Nullity)  $\chi(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ .
- (2) (Local Covering) For each  $A \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $W_{A,\chi(A)}(i) = W_{A,I'}(i)$  and  $W_{A,I'-\chi(A)}(i) = 0$  for  $\mu$ -almost every  $i$ .
- (3) (Local Minimality) For each measurable  $A \subseteq I$  and  $B \subseteq \chi(A)$  with  $w_A(B) > 0$ ,  $W_{A,\chi(A)-B}(i) < W_A(i)$  and  $W_{A,I'-(\chi(A)-B)}(i) > 0$  for  $\mu$ -almost every  $i$ .<sup>3</sup>

The next theorem demonstrates that a child-set mapping always exists, and is in fact essentially unique up to  $\mu'$ -measure zero. Thus we refer to “the” child-set mapping.

**Theorem E.2** (Existence and Essential Uniqueness of The Child-Set Mapping). Let  $w$  be a non-trivial evolutionary process. The child-set mapping  $\chi$  exists and is essentially unique. That is, any two strong child-set mappings  $\chi, \chi'$  agree up to sets of  $\mu'$  measure zero, with  $\chi(A) \approx \chi'(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$ .

We say that a set-mapping is a “weak child-set mapping” if it satisfies the Nullity and Covering properties of Definition E.1, but not Minimality. To prove the result, we first show that the set of weak child-set mappings forms a mathematical lattice. Child-set mappings are the minimal elements of this lattice. To prove Theorem E.2 we show these minimal elements exist and are unique up to  $\mu'$ -measure zero.

**Lemma E.3** (Lattice of Weak Child-Set Mappings). The set of weak child-set mappings is a non-empty lattice, i.e., closed under set-wise intersections and unions, and compatible with the partial order of set inclusion.<sup>4</sup> A child-set mapping is a minimal element of the lattice.

*Proof of Lemma E.3.* Let  $\Lambda$  denote the set of weak child-set mappings. Consider two child-set mappings  $\chi, \chi' \in \Lambda$ . Define the meet  $(\chi \wedge \chi')(A) := \chi(A) \cap \chi'(A)$  and join  $(\chi \vee \chi')(A) := \chi(A) \cup \chi'(A)$ , and define the partial ordering  $\chi' \prec \chi$  if  $\chi'(A) \subseteq \chi(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$ . Clearly, the intersection and union satisfy the nullity property of Definition E.1.

By the Local Covering property, note that for each  $i \in A$ ,  $\chi(A)$  and  $\chi'(A)$  each have full  $w_i$  measure. The intersection and union of full measure sets is again full measure, proving the Local Covering property for the meet and join, hence they are child-set mappings.

The partial ordering is lattice-compatible with the meet and join owing to the lattice compatibility of set-wise intersections and unions relative to set inclusion. Thus  $\Lambda$  is a lattice.

Weak child-set mappings always exist, e.g., the maximal covering  $\chi(A) := I'$  for  $A$ , which is a weak child-set mapping even for trivial processes.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem E.2.* We first show that  $\Lambda$  has a minimal element using a Zorn’s lemma argument. Such a minimal element is a child-set mapping, and we show that any two such mappings are equal up to sets of measure zero.

Consider a decreasing chain of child-set mappings  $C = (\chi^t)$ , for a totally ordered index set  $T$ . We show that  $C$  has a minimal element. Let  $(t_n)$  be a countable set of index elements

<sup>3</sup>If  $w_A(I') = 0$ , then  $W_{A,\chi(A)} = 0$  and  $W_{A,I'-\chi(A)}(i) = 0$  for  $\mu$ -almost every  $i$ .

<sup>4</sup>i.e., for weak child-set mappings  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$ , the intersection and union mappings defined by  $(\chi \wedge \chi')(A) := \chi(A) \cap \chi'(A)$  and  $(\chi \vee \chi')(A) := \chi(A) \cup \chi'(A)$  are weak child-set mappings, and they are lattice compatible with the partial order defined by  $\chi' \prec \chi$  if  $\chi'(A) \subseteq \chi(A)$  for all  $A$ .

such that  $t_n \uparrow \infty$ .<sup>5</sup> Define the child-set mapping  $\chi^\infty(A) := (\bigwedge_n \chi^{t_n})(A) = \bigcap_n \chi^{t_n}(A)$ . Since the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{I}$  is closed under countable intersections,  $\chi^\infty$  is well-defined and a minimal element of  $\mathcal{C}$ . By Zorn's lemma,  $\Lambda$  has a global minimizer, hence child-set mappings exist.

To see essential uniqueness, suppose  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$  are child-set mappings. Then  $\mu'(\chi(A)\Delta\chi'(A)) = \int_A w_i(\chi(A)\Delta\chi'(A))\mu(di) = 0$ , proving the result.  $\square$

**E.2. Proof of Efficiency, Consistency, and Reversibility Theorems.** We show that a purely mixing environmental process can always be inverted on the right, before the process has executed (i.e., there exists  $w'$  such that  $w_{\text{EC}} \circ w' = 1_{\mu'}$ ). Essentially, we define the process by taking each child's unit of population, mapping it back arbitrarily to the parents, then mapping forward through the environmental mapping. Such a right-inverse process is not unique owing to the arbitrary selection of the parent mapping, which is then canceled out in the mixing from  $w_{\text{EC}}$ .

We state a simple local-to-global principle for purely mixing processes. Then we show that the child-set mapping  $\chi$  for a purely mixing process is always left-invertible. This allows us to build a right-inverse process  $w'$  for which  $(w')^{-1} = \chi$ .

Note that for any expectation  $\mathbb{E}$  and any non-negative random variable  $X \geq 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[-X \log X] = 0 \text{ if and only if } X(i) \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } \mu\text{-almost every } i, \quad (\text{E.2})$$

because the real-valued function  $x \mapsto -x \log x$  vanishes if and only if  $x = 0, 1$ .

**Lemma E.4** (Purely Mixing Local-to-Global Principle). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process. The following are equivalent:

- (1)  $w$  is purely mixing and  $S_{\text{dis}} = 0$  (i.e., for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ,  $D_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. and  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = 0$ ).
- (2) For each  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ,  $w$  is locally purely mixing from  $A$  to  $B$  and  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = 0$  (i.e.,  $D_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s.).

*Proof.* The proof is trivial since  $S_{\text{dis}} = \sup \sum S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = \sup \sum \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[-D_{A,B} \log D_{A,B}]$ . If the global entropy vanishes, then all local entropies vanish, and so  $D_{A,B} = 0$  or  $1$  by (E.2). If all local entropies vanish, then their sum and hence the supremum vanish.  $\square$

**Proposition E.5.** Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process. Then  $w$  is purely mixing if and only if the child-set mapping  $\chi$  is essentially a left-inverse of  $w^{-1}$  (i.e.,  $(\chi \circ w^{-1})(B) \approx B$  up to  $\mu'$ -measure zero for any  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ).

*Proof.* Let  $\chi$  denote the child-set mapping.<sup>6</sup> Consider measurable  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ , and suppose that  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = 0$ . Consider  $B' \in \mathcal{I}'_B$ . To prove left-invertibility from  $A$  to  $B$ , we must show that  $B'' := \chi(w_{A,B}^{-1}B') \approx B'$ . By the covering property of the child-set mapping  $\chi$ , we have

$$W_{w^{-1}B',B''} = W_{w^{-1}B',B} \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Since both  $W_{w^{-1}B',B'}$  and  $W_{w^{-1}B',B}$  are positive, by Lemma E.4, we have

$$W_{w^{-1}B',B'} = W = W_{w^{-1}B',B} \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

Consequently,  $W_{A-w^{-1}B',B} = 0$ . It follows that

$$W_{A,B' \triangle B''} = W_{w^{-1}B',B' \triangle B''} = 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{E.5})$$

<sup>5</sup>i.e., for any  $t_* \in T$ , there exists  $n_*$  such that  $t_n \geq t_*$  for  $n \geq n_*$ .

<sup>6</sup>We do not need the minimality property of child-set mappings for this proposition, only the covering property.

Thus  $B'' \approx B'$ , proving that  $\chi$  is a left inverse of  $w_{\text{EC}}$  from  $A$  to  $B$ . By combining over arbitrary partitions, we have that  $\chi$  is a general left inverse.

Conversely, suppose that  $S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) > 0$ , so there exist  $A'$  and  $B'$  such that  $0 < W_{A', B'} < W_{A', I'}$  and  $0 < W_{A', B-B'} < W_{A', I'}$  on a set of positive measure. Thus  $\chi(w_{A, B}^{-1} B') \cap (B - B') \neq \emptyset$ , proving that  $\chi$  is not a left inverse.  $\square$

*Proof of Efficiency Theorem (Theorem 18.1).* Suppose that  $w$  is purely mixing. We show that there exists a right inverse, i.e., a process  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \tilde{\mu}$  such that for all  $B$ ,

$$(w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(B) = 1 \text{ for } i' \in B. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

By the purely mixing hypothesis ( $W_{A, B} = W$  a.s.), (E.6) is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(B) = \int_I w_{\text{EC}, \tilde{i}}(B) w'_{i'}(d\tilde{i}) = \int_{w^{-1}B} \frac{W_{w^{-1}B, B}(\tilde{i})}{W(\tilde{i})} w'_{i'}(d\tilde{i}) \\ &= w'_{i'}(w^{-1}B) \text{ for } i' \in B. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.7})$$

We construct a family of such processes by taking partition refinements. For each partition  $\mathcal{B}$ , consider the topological space  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}}$  of processes satisfying the condition (E.7) for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , equipped with the topology of almost-sure weak convergence of measures.<sup>7</sup> The space  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}}$  is closed, convex, and complete. Each process  $w' \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}}$  corresponds to a measure  $w'_B$  on each parent set  $w^{-1}B$ , with the process satisfying  $w'_{i'} \equiv w'_B$  for all  $i' \in B$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}'$  be a refinement of  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e., each set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is a disjoint union of sets in  $\mathcal{B}'$ . We show  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}'} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Consider a refined process  $w' \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}'}$ . For each  $i'$ , let  $B_{i'}$  (resp.  $B'_{i'}$ ) be the partition set of  $\mathcal{B}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}'$ ) containing  $i'$ . We define a coarse version  $\hat{w}' \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}}$  by setting  $\hat{w}'_{i'}(A) := w'_{i'}(A \cap w^{-1}B_{i'})$  for all  $A$ .

Finally, let  $\mathcal{B}^t$  be a net of partition refinements, and consider the infinitary intersection  $\mathcal{W}_{\infty} := \bigcap_t \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{B}^t}$ . As the intersection of non-empty, closed, convex, complete spaces,  $\mathcal{W}_{\infty}$  is non-empty.

To see that each  $w' \in \mathcal{W}_{\infty}$  satisfies condition (E.7) for arbitrary  $B$ , let  $\epsilon > 0$  and consider a refinement  $\mathcal{B}^t$  such that we can approximate  $B$  by sets  $\{B'\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}^t$  satisfying  $|w'_{i'}(w^{-1}B) - w'_{i'}(\bigcup w^{-1}B')| < \epsilon$  for  $\mu'$ -almost all  $i' \in B$ . Then  $|w'_{i'}(w^{-1}B) - 1| \leq \epsilon + |w'_{i'}(\bigcup w^{-1}B') - 1| = \epsilon$  since  $w'$  must give full measure at  $i'$  to the parent set containing  $i'$ . Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, (E.7) must hold for  $B$ , proving that there exists a retraction.

If  $S_{\text{dis}} = 0$  and  $S_{\text{mix}} > 0$ , then there exist distinct  $A, A'$  such that  $\chi(A) = \chi(A') = B$ , so the space  $\mathcal{W}_{\infty}$  includes at least two retractions, one which sends full measure from  $B$  to  $A$ , and the other to  $A'$ .

Suppose  $S_{\text{dis}} > 0$ , so  $w$  is not purely mixing. Then there exist  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and disjoint  $B, B' \in \mathcal{I}'$  of positive measure such that  $\chi(A) = B \cup B'$  and  $w^{-1}B = A = w^{-1}B'$ . Then for any environmental process  $w'$ ,

$$1 = (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(I') \geq (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(\chi(A)) = (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(w^{-1}B) + (w_{\text{EC}} \circ w')_{i'}(w^{-1}B'), \quad (\text{E.8})$$

so at least one of the terms on the right side must be  $< 1$ , thus  $w'$  is not a retraction.  $\square$

We next show that a purely dispersive environmental process can always be inverted on after the process has executed (i.e., there exists  $w'$  such that  $w' \circ w_{\text{EC}} = 1_{\tilde{\mu}}$ ). In this case, we define the process by taking each child's unit of population, and map it back to the unique

<sup>7</sup>That is, a net of processes  $(w'_t)$  converges to  $w'$  if on a set  $B$  of full  $\mu'$  measure, we have  $w'_{t, i'} \rightarrow w'_{\text{EC}, i'}$  for each  $i' \in B$ .

parent from which it came. Such a left-inverse process is unique, since in a purely dispersive process, every parent is unique.

We state a simple local-to-global principle for purely dispersive processes, and we use this to show that the child-set mapping  $\chi$  for a purely dispersive process is always right-invertible. This allows us to build the left-inverse process  $w'$ .

**Lemma E.6** (Purely Dispersive Local-to-Global Principle). Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process. The following are equivalent:

- (1)  $w$  is purely dispersive and  $S_{\text{mix}} = 0$  (i.e., for all  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ,  $M_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s. and  $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = 0$ ).
- (2) For each  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$ ,  $w$  is locally purely dispersive from  $A$  to  $B$  and  $S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = 0$  (i.e.,  $M_{A,B} \in \{0, 1\}$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.s.).

*Proof.* The proof is trivial since  $S_{\text{mix}} = \sup \sum S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = \sup \sum \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B}]$ . If the global entropy vanishes, then all local entropies vanish, and so  $M_{A,B} = 0$  or  $1$  by (E.2). If all local entropies vanish, then their sum and hence the supremum vanish.  $\square$

**Proposition E.7.** Let  $w$  be a finite-entropy process. Then  $w$  is purely dispersive if and only if the child-set mapping  $\chi$  is a right-inverse of  $w^{-1}$  (i.e.,  $(w^{-1} \circ \chi)(A) \approx A$  up to  $\tilde{\mu}$ -measure zero for any  $A \in \mathcal{I}_+$ ).

*Proof.* Let  $\chi$  denote a child-set covering mapping.<sup>8</sup> For a given  $A \in \mathcal{I}$ , define its child set  $B := \chi(A)$ . Define the complement of the parent set  $A^c := I - A$  and the complementary child set:  $B' := \chi(A^c)$ .<sup>9</sup>

Suppose that  $S_{\text{mix}} = 0$ . We will show that consistency implies  $B \cap B' \approx \emptyset$  up to  $\mu$ -measure zero, which implies  $(w^{-1} \circ \chi)(A) = A$ , i.e., that  $\chi$  is a right inverse to  $w^{-1}$ , so  $w$  is consistent.

By the covering property of child-set mappings, we have:

$$W_{A,B} = W_{A,I'} \text{ and } W_{A^c,B'} = W_{A^c,I'} = W - W_{A,I'} \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{E.9})$$

By Lemma E.6, we have

$$W_{A,B} = W_{A,I'} = \bar{U}_{A,I'} W_A \text{ and } W_{A^c,B'} = W_{A^c,I'} = \bar{U}_{A^c,I'} W_{A^c} \text{ a.s.,} \quad (\text{E.10})$$

and

$$W_{I,B \cap B'} = \bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} W \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{I,B \cap B'} &= \bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} W = \bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} (W_A + W_{A^c}) \\ &= \bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} \left( \frac{W_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,I'}} + \frac{W_{A^c,B'}}{\bar{U}_{A^c,I'}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'}}{\bar{U}_{A,I'}} W_{A,B} + \frac{\bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'}}{\bar{U}_{A^c,I'}} W_{A^c,B'}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.12})$$

Now, the sets  $A$  and  $A^c$  are mutually exclusive, so only one term can be positive. If  $W_{A,B} > 0$ , then  $W_{A^c,B'} = 0$ , and so  $\bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} = 0$ . Similarly, if  $W_{A^c,B'} > 0$ , then  $\bar{U}_{I,B \cap B'} = 0$ . Thus  $W_{I,B \cap B'} = 0$  a.s., and so  $B \cap B' \approx \emptyset$ .

<sup>8</sup>We do not need the minimality property of child-set mappings for this proof.

<sup>9</sup>It is possible for the child set and the complementary child set to overlap, i.e.,  $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ , namely, for children who have parents in both  $A$  and  $A^c$ .

It follows that  $(w^{-1} \circ \chi)(A) \approx A$  up to measure zero, so  $\chi$  is a right inverse to  $w^{-1}$ , and so  $w$  is locally consistent from  $A$  to  $B$ . This proves the forward direction.

Suppose  $S_{\text{mix}} > 0$ , so there exist  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $0 < W_{A,B} < \overline{U}_{A,B}W$  and  $0 < W_{A,I'-B} < \overline{U}_{A,I'}W_{A,I'}$  on a set of positive measure. Thus  $w^{-1}(\chi(B)) \cap (I' - B) \neq \emptyset$ , proving that  $\chi$  is not efficient. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Consistency Theorem (Theorem 18.2).* Suppose that  $w$  is purely dispersive. We show that there exists a left inverse, i.e., a process  $w' : \mu' \mapsto \tilde{\mu}$  such that for all  $B$ ,

$$(w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A) = 1 \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}\text{-a.s. } \tilde{A} \in A. \quad (\text{E.13})$$

We construct the process  $w'$  by sending each child to its unique parent:

$$w'_{i'}(A) := \begin{cases} 1, & i' \in \chi(A), \\ 0 & i' \notin \chi(A). \end{cases} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

This is well-defined by the purely dispersive hypothesis. Indeed, if  $A$  and  $A'$  are disjoint, then  $\chi(A)$  and  $\chi(A')$  are disjoint, since  $w^{-1}(\chi(A) \cap \chi(A')) = w^{-1}(\chi(A)) \cap w^{-1}(\chi(A')) = A \cap A' = \emptyset$ , where  $\chi$  is a right-inverse by pure dispersivity.

The process  $w'$  is a left inverse, since for each  $\tilde{i} \in A$ ,

$$(w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A) = \int w'_{i'}(A) w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}}(di') = w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}}(\chi(A)) = \frac{W_{A,\chi(A)}(\tilde{i})}{W(\tilde{i})} = 1, \quad (\text{E.15})$$

since  $w$  is purely dispersive and so  $W_{A,\chi(A)}(\tilde{i}) = W(\tilde{i})$  almost surely. Thus  $w'$  is a left-inverse.

We show that  $w'$  is essentially unique. Suppose  $w''$  is another left inverse. Consider arbitrary  $A$ , and let  $B := \{i' : w''_{i'}(A) - 1 \neq 0\}$ . Let  $A' := w^{-1}B$ . If  $B$  has non-negative measure, then

$$0 = (w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A') - 1 = \int_B (w'_{i'}(A) - 1) w_{\text{EC},\tilde{i}}(di') \neq 0, \quad (\text{E.16})$$

a contradiction, so  $w'$  is essentially unique.

Now suppose that  $w$  is not purely dispersive. Then there exist disjoint  $A, A' \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}'$  of positive measure such that  $B \subseteq \chi(A) \cap \chi(A')$  and  $w^{-1}B = A \cup A'$ . Then for any purely environmental process  $w'$ ,

$$1 = (w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(I) \geq (w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A \cup A') = (w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A) + (w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(A') = 2(w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(w^{-1}B), \quad (\text{E.17})$$

hence  $(w' \circ w_{\text{EC}})_{\tilde{i}}(w^{-1}B) < 1$ , and so  $w'$  is not a section.  $\square$

*Proof of Reversibility Theorem (Theorem 18.3).* We now prove the Reversibility Theorem. Suppose  $w$  is purely mixing and purely dispersive. Since  $w$  is purely dispersive, there exists a unique retraction (left-inverse process)  $w'$  from the Consistency Theorem, defined by  $w'_{i'}(A) = 1$  for all  $i' \in \chi(A)$ . Since  $w$  is purely mixing, Proposition E.5 implies that  $\chi$  is a left inverse to  $w^{-1}$ . Consequently, for any  $B$ , we have  $w'_{i'}(w^{-1}B) = 1$  if  $i' \in \chi(w^{-1}(B)) \approx B$ . Thus by (E.7),  $w'$  is a section (right-inverse process). This proves that  $w'$  is the unique inverse to  $w_{\text{EC}}$ .

Now, suppose that  $w'$  is an inverse process to  $w_{\text{EC}}$ . In particular,  $w'$  is the unique retraction for the Consistency Theorem, hence  $w$  is purely dispersive, and  $w'$  is a section for the Efficiency Theorem, hence  $w$  is purely dispersive. This proves the Reversibility Theorem.

The Irreversibility Theorem follows from the law of the excluded middle, as the contrapositive of the Reversibility Theorem.  $\square$

## APPENDIX F. PROOF OF STRONG THIRD LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION (THEOREM 20.4)

*Proof of Strong Third Law (Theorem 20.4).* We first prove local versions of the result:

$$\tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\gamma_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) \leq \tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\varphi_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\mathbb{E}[D_{A,B}^2]}, \quad (\text{F.1})$$

$$\tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B}\bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \leq \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \leq \tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}\bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}, \quad (\text{F.2})$$

and

$$\tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\lambda_{A,B}^2}{\gamma_{A,B}\varphi_{A,B}\bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^3} \leq \partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{EC}}(A, B) \leq \tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\gamma_{A,B}\varphi_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}^2\bar{U}_{A,B}} - \bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}\mathbb{E}[D_{A,B}^2]}, \quad (\text{F.3})$$

with saturation of all inequalities when  $w$  is in local environmental equilibrium from  $A$  to  $B$ . The partition versions follow by summing over partition sets, and the general versions follow by evaluating at a generating joint partition.

Proof of (F.1) We decompose the dispersion entropy change as  $\partial_{\text{NS}}S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U(-D_{A,B}\log D_{A,B})] - S_{\text{dis}}(A, B)$ . Flipping the bounds of the dispersion-entropy estimates (19.6) yields the following for the second term:

$$-\bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}} \leq -S_{\text{dis}}(A, B) \leq -\bar{U}_{A,B}\log\frac{\bar{U}_{A,B}}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}, \quad (\text{F.4})$$

with saturation in environmental equilibrium from  $A$  to  $B$ .

Using Jensen's inequality, we compute the upper bound of the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U(-D_{A,B}\log D_{A,B})] &= \tilde{p}_{A,B}\varphi_{A,B}\frac{1}{\varphi_{A,B}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U(-D_{A,B}\log D_{A,B})] \\ &\leq -\tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B}} = \tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\varphi_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.5})$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U] = \varphi_{A,B}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}] = \lambda_{A,B}$ . Saturation occurs when  $D_{A,B}$  is constant  $U\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, which is equivalent to being constant  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, i.e., the environmental-equilibrium case. Combining (F.5) and (F.4) yields the upper bound of (F.1).

We compute the lower bound of the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U(-D_{A,B}\log D_{A,B})] &= \tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\frac{1}{\lambda_{A,B}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}(-\log D_{A,B})] \\ &\geq -\tilde{p}_{A,B}\lambda_{A,B}\log\frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.6})$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}] = \lambda_{A,B}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UD_{A,B}^2] = \gamma_{A,B}$ . Saturation occurs when  $D_{A,B}$  is constant  $UD_{A,B}\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, which is equivalent to being constant  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, i.e., the environmental-equilibrium case. Combining (F.6) and (F.4) yields the lower bound of (F.1).

Proof of (F.2)) We decompose the mixing entropy change as  $\partial_{\text{NS}} S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) = \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U(M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B})] - S_{\text{mix}}$ . Flipping the bounds of the mixing-entropy estimates (19.7) yields the following for the second term:

$$-\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] \leq -S_{\text{mix}}(A, B) \leq -\bar{U}_{A,B} \log \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{A,B}}, \quad (\text{F.7})$$

with saturation in environmental equilibrium from  $A$  to  $B$ .

Using Jensen's inequality, we compute the upper bound of the first mixing term:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[UM_{A,B}(\log M_{A,B})] &= \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{p}_{A,B} \frac{\lambda_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}(\log M_{A,B})] \\ &\leq \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\bar{U}_{A,B} \gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}^2} = \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{\lambda_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.8})$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}] = \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}^2] = \frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2}$ . Saturation occurs when  $D_{A,B}$  is constant  $U\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, which is equivalent to being constant  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, i.e., the environmental-equilibrium case. Combining (F.8) and (F.7) yields the upper bound of (F.1). We compute the lower bound of the first mixing term:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[U(M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B})] &= \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{p}_{A,B} \varphi_{A,B} \frac{1}{\varphi_{A,B}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U(M_{A,B} \log M_{A,B})] \\ &\geq \bar{U}_{A,B} \tilde{p}_{A,B} \varphi_{A,B} \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}} \log \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}} \\ &= \tilde{p}_{A,B} \lambda_{A,B} \log \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\varphi_{A,B} \bar{U}_{A,B}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.9})$$

since  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[U] = \varphi_{A,B}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{A,B}[UM_{A,B}] = \frac{\lambda_{A,B}}{\bar{U}_{A,B}}$ . Saturation occurs when  $D_{A,B}$  is constant  $UD_{A,B}\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, which is equivalent to being constant  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely, i.e., the environmental-equilibrium case. Combining (F.9) and (F.7) yields the lower bound of (F.1).

Proof of (F.3)) The environmental inequality (F.3) follows by summing inequalities (F.1) and (F.2), and using the identity  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[M_{A,B}^2] = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[D_{A,B}^2]}{\bar{U}_{A,B}^2}$ .  $\square$