

# A diploid population model for copy number variation of genetic elements

Peter Pfaffelhuber<sup>1</sup>      Anton Wakolbinger<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

We study the following model for a diploid population of constant size  $N$ : Every individual carries a random number of (genetic) elements. Upon a reproduction event (which occurs at rate 1 per pair of individuals), each of the two parents inherits each element with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  to the offspring. We study convergence of  $X^N = (X_0^N, X_1^N, \dots)$ , where  $X_k^N$  is the frequency of individuals carrying  $k$  elements, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We find convergence (in some weak sense) to  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $X_t = \text{Poi}(Z_t)$  and  $Z_t$  evolves according to a critical Feller branching process. We discuss heuristics explaining this finding and some extensions and limitations.

**Keywords:** Poisson approximation; Feller branching diffusion; transposable elements.

**MSC2020 subject classifications:** Primary 92D15, Secondary 60J80; 60F17; 60G57.

## 1 Introduction and main result

The motivation of the present study is twofold. From a mathematical point of view, it leads to a new large population limit of a system of particles performing a coordinated and spatially structured critical branching in a rapidly fluctuating random environment given by a bi-parental Moran graph; see also Remark 2.1 for a more detailed description. The biological motivation is to model the evolution of transposable elements. These are repetitive sequences of 100 base pairs or longer, which are able to relocate within the genome of a host; see e.g. Bourque et al. (2018) for a review on transposable elements. In the limit of high relocation and recombination activity, such genetic elements (GEs) all appear at different locations within a diploid genome, and are inherited independently to the offspring.

We thus consider a population of size  $N$  (the number of diploids) undergoing random reproduction events at rate  $N^2/2$ . Each individual has a type in  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , where type  $k$  means that the individual carries  $k$  GEs in its genome. At a reproduction event a randomly chosen individual dies, and a randomly chosen pair of individuals produces some offspring. If the types of the parents are  $k$  and  $l$ , then the type of the offspring has a binomial distribution with parameters  $k+l$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , i.e. it inherits each GE from both parents with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Thus, if  $x_k$  denotes the current fraction of individuals of type

<sup>1</sup> University of Freiburg, Germany. E-mail: p.p@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de

<sup>2</sup> Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany. E-mail: wakolbin@math.uni-frankfurt.de

$k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , and  $x := (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ , then the jump rate from  $x$  to  $x + (e_m - e_n)/N$  is

$$\frac{N^2}{2} x_n \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \binom{k+l}{m} 2^{-(k+l)}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $e_m$  is the  $m$ th unit vector,  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . This gives rise to a Markovian jump process  $X^N := (X_t^N)_{t \geq 0}$  taking its values in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ , the set of probability measures on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ . We write  $R_t^N := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k X_t^N(k)$  for the average number of GEs per individual at time  $t$ . Our main result concerns the convergence in distribution of the sequence of stochastic processes  $(R^N, X^N)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The limiting process will turn out to be  $(Z, X)$ , where  $Z$  is a *standard Feller branching diffusion* obeying the SDE

$$dZ_t = \sqrt{Z_t} dW_t, \quad Z_0 = z \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$X_t = \text{Poi}(Z_t), \quad t > 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$  denotes the Poisson distribution on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  with parameter  $\lambda > 0$ .

To specify a topology underlying this convergence we define the *weighted occupation measure* of a  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ -valued path  $\xi$  as the probability measure

$$\Gamma_{\xi}([0, t] \times A) := \int_0^t e^{-s} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_s \in A\}} ds, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $t \geq 0$  and  $A$  is a measurable subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ . Following Kurtz (1991) we say that a sequence  $(\xi^N)$  in  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ , the set of càdlàg  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ -valued paths indexed by  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , converges in measure to a  $\xi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$  if the sequence of probability measures  $\Gamma_{\xi^N}$  converges weakly to  $\Gamma_{\xi}$ . On  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  we will use the Skorokhod (J1) topology, see e.g. Chapter 3 in Ethier and Kurtz (1986).

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $X^N$  be the  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ -valued Markov jump process with jump rates as in (1.1), starting in  $X_0^N$  with atoms of size  $N^{-1}$ . Assume that, for some  $z > 0$ ,  $R_0^N = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k X_0^N(k) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} z$  in probability, and  $\sup_N \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^2 X_0^N(k) \leq C < \infty$  a.s. Then  $(R^N, X^N)$  converges in distribution to  $(Z, X)$  obeying (1.2) and (1.3), where  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+) \times \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$  is equipped with the Skorokhod topology in the first, and with the topology of convergence in measure in the second coordinate.*

In particular, Theorem 1.1 shows that the average number of GEs per individual becomes Markovian in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This average follows the dynamics of a Feller branching diffusion, and the distribution of the total number of GEs is Poisson at all points in time. The proof of Theorem 1.1 can be found in Section 3.

## 2 Perspectives and background

**Remark 2.1** (An individual-based graphical construction). The following individual-based construction of the process  $X^N$  gives a heuristic explanation of why Poisson limits and Feller's branching diffusion should appear in the situation of Theorem 1.1. Let  $\Pi_{hij}$ ,  $h, i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , be a family of independent rate  $N^{-1}$  Poisson point processes on the time axis. At each time point  $t$  of  $\Pi_{hij}$  draw a pair of arrows, one from  $(i, t)$  to  $(h, t)$  and one from  $(j, t)$  to  $(h, t)$ . This gives rise to the *bi-parental Moran graph*  $\mathcal{G}_N$  with vertex set  $\{1, \dots, N\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , see Figure 1.

The graph  $\mathcal{G}_N$  serves as a random environment for a coordinated, structured branching process of the population of GEs. Specifically, for  $t_1 \in \Pi_{hij}$  (as in Figure 1), each GE arriving at a point  $(i, t_1)$  tosses a fair coin. In case of "success" it puts one offspring at  $(h, t_1)$ , and in any case it continues to live at  $(i, t_1)$  if  $h \neq i$ . The same happens

Copy number variation of genetic elements




Figure 1: A detail of the graph  $\mathcal{G}_N$ , with a point of  $\Pi_{hij}$  at  $t_1$ .

for the GEs arriving at  $(j, t_1-)$ . The population at  $(h, t_1-)$  is replaced by the sum of the offspring of the populations at  $(i, t_1-)$  and  $(j, t_1-)$ . Thus, averaged over  $\mathcal{G}_N$ , the offspring of a single GE experiences a critical binary branching process with branching rate  $N$  and with coordinated branching in the sense that GEs living in the same host are affected by simultaneous reproduction events. This coordination of the branching also induces a dependence between the offspring of different ancestral GEs. It turns out, however, that the population of GEs is continuously spread quickly enough over the space  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  of hosts so that the dependencies introduced by the local coordination become negligible as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . More precisely, let the initial GE numbers be given by a, say, i.i.d. family  $(Y_i^N(0))_{i \in [N]}$  of  $\mathbb{N}_0$ -valued random variables with finite second moment, and let  $(Y_i^N(t))_{i=1, \dots, N}$  be the GE numbers at time  $t$  that arise through the branching dynamics along the random graph  $\mathcal{G}_N$  as described above. Then already at time  $t_1 = \log \log N/N$  (and thus before an effective change of the total number of GEs has occurred) the numbers  $Y_h(t_1)$  of GEs in host  $h$  are close to Poisson. This can be seen by tracing the ancestry of  $(h, t_1)$  in  $\mathcal{G}_N$  back to time 0. For large  $N$ , this ancestry forms with high probability a binary splitting tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with root at  $(h, t_1)$  and (order of)  $\log N$  leaves at time 0. In the situation of Figure 1, the random number  $Y_h(t_1)$  arises, conditional on  $Y_i(t_1)$  and  $Y_j(t_1)$ , as the sum of two independent binomially distributed random variables with parameters  $Y_i(t_1), \frac{1}{2}$  and  $Y_j(t_1), \frac{1}{2}$ , respectively. Playing this back to time 0 and applying a reasoning similar as in the proof of Lemma 3.8 below shows that the distribution of  $Y_h(t_1)$  is close to Poisson for large  $N$ .

It is easily seen that the total number of GEs,  $NR_t^N = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(t)$  is a martingale. As time proceeds, the ongoing (quick) Poissonization of  $(Y_i^N(t))_{i=1, \dots, N}$  happens conditional on the current value of  $R_t^N$ . As it turns out (cf. Proposition 3.9), the near-Poissonicity of  $(Y_i^N(t))_{i=1, \dots, N}$  helps to control the quadratic variation of  $R^N$  and to prove that  $R^N$  converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a standard Feller branching diffusion.

**Remark 2.2** (Stochastic slow/fast systems). As we will see,  $(R^N, X^N)$  is a slow/fast system, for which  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{I}$ , the set of Poisson distributions on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , forms a stable manifold. Such systems have been studied intensively, see e.g. Kurtz (1992); Pardoux and Veretennikov (2001); Berglund and Gentz (2006). We could not find a result in the general theory which covers the situation of our Theorem, but the method of Katzenberger (1991) comes pretty close. More precisely, as will become clear in the proof of Theorem 1.1,  $R^N$  is slow in the sense that there is an operator which describes the (asymptotically) fastest part of the dynamics of  $X^N$  and which vanishes on functions depending only on the first moment of  $x$ ; see Lemma 3.3. In other words, the fast dynamics has the property that

$\mathcal{POT}$  is invariant. The dynamics is therefore only governed by motions within  $\mathcal{POT}$ , and indeed the convergence of  $R^N$  to  $Z$  is guaranteed by Theorem 1.1 as well.

Actually, the setting of a fast dynamics giving rise to a dynamics of a lower dimensional manifold was given (for finite-dimensional semimartingales) in Katzenberger (1991). However, we failed to show the conditions of Katzenberger (1991) on the convergence towards the manifold, since we are lacking a general bound how the fast dynamics pushes the system to the manifold. Rather, we use some martingale arguments for this convergence; see Proposition 3.7. These are not sufficient to show convergence in the Skorohod sense (as in Katzenberger (1991)), but only in a weaker sense, cf. Remark 2.3.2 below. We believe that one could come up with a general statement about convergence of slow/fast systems under weak conditions and conclusions similar to the setting of Katzenberger (1991).

**Remark 2.3** (A note on topologies). 1. Tightness criteria for càdlàg processes with respect to convergence in measure were given in Meyer and Zheng (1984), and refined in Kurtz (1991). In contrast to these approaches, we show convergence in measure of  $X^N$  in two steps. First, we show tightness of  $\Gamma_{X^N}$  (as random probability measures on  $[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ ). In a second step, we show that any limit  $\Gamma$  must be concentrated on the product of  $[0, \infty)$  and the set of Poisson distributions on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ . Finally, since  $\frac{1}{N}R^N$  converges to the Feller branching diffusion  $Z$ , we conclude that  $\Gamma = \Gamma_X$  for  $X = (\text{Poi}(Z_t))_{t \geq 0}$ .

2. We conjecture that, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the sequence of processes  $(X_t^N)_{t \in [\varepsilon, \infty)}$  converges in distribution to the process  $(\text{Poi}(Z_t))_{t \in [\varepsilon, \infty)}$  with respect to the Skorohod J1 topology, where  $Z$  is the Feller branching diffusion solving (1.2). However, the techniques we use in our proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 3, while being strong enough to prove convergence of occupation measures  $\Gamma_{X^N}$  and the process of first moments  $(\rho_1(X_t^N))$ , are too weak to conclude tightness of  $X^N$  in the Skorohod topology; see also Remark 2.2 above.

**Remark 2.4** (Extensions). The population model with jump rates given through (1.1) is neutral in the sense that (i) the number of GEs does not change on average in all individuals and (ii) the probability to be involved in a reproduction event does not depend on the number of GEs an individual carries. Both assumption can be relaxed. For (i), we might assume that an individual of type  $k$  acquires new GEs at rate  $\mu + k\nu$ , and each GE is lost (or silenced) at rate  $\beta$ . For (ii), we might assume that an individual of type  $k$  is chosen as a parent with probability proportional to  $(1 - \alpha/N)^k \approx 1 - k\alpha/N$ , for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Under this selective model, we strongly conjecture that Theorem 1.1 still holds, but with (1.2) changed to

$$dZ = (\mu + (\nu - \beta - \alpha)Z)dt + \sqrt{Z}dW,$$

i.e. to a non-critical Feller branching diffusion with immigration.

**Remark 2.5** (Context and novelty of the model). Bi-parental population models have been studied to some extent. Chang (1999) and Rohde et al. (2004) analyze the common ancestry of all living humans. Coron and Le Jan (2020), study the distribution of the genetic material which an ancestor contributes to today's population. They consider a scaling limit of a biparental model in which first the number of generations and then the population size tends to infinity. Other population genetic models only implicitly assume two parents by using an ancestral recombination graph (Griffiths and Marjoram, 1997). Wakeley and co-authors study the effect of the bi-parental pedigree on the evolution of allele frequencies (e.g. Wakeley et al., 2012, 2016).

A novelty in our model lies in the study of a large population on the evolutionary timescale (i.e. one unit of time is  $O(N)$  generations) together with a free recombination on the generation timescale, in the sense that the two parents of each individual are considered at each reproduction event. In all of the above mentioned papers, either time

is rescaled or recombination is free, but not both. In our setting, we are able to combine within the same model the rescaling of time with a rapid *and* free recombination, and to prove convergence in the limit of large populations on the evolutionary timescale. In spirit, our model fits the framework of the Poisson Random Field approach taken by Sawyer and Hartl (1992); see also Sethupathy and Hannenhalli (2008) for a review. In such models, all loci evolve independently due to free recombination. We do not model genomic loci explicitly but consider the total number of GEs, which are distributed somewhere in the genome. Starting from an individual-based finite population model, we show that this total number is for large populations asymptotically Poisson in each individual genome, with a random intensity that follows Feller's branching diffusion on the evolutionary timescale.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The arguments from the graphical construction in Remark 2.1 give some intuition why Theorem 1.1 holds, and might even help to prove the conjecture formulated in Remark 2.3. So far we were not able to achieve this, and thus our proof proceeds via a different route. The main steps are as follows: After introducing some notation in Section 3.1, we start by analysing the generator of  $X^N$  in Section 3.2. We will see that we can collect terms which are of order  $N^1, N^0, N^{-1}, \dots$ , i.e.  $G^N = NG_1 + G_0 + O(N^{-1})$ ; see Lemma 3.5. Moreover, we see that  $G_1 f = 0$  if  $f$  only depends on  $x$  via its first moment  $\rho_1(x)$ ; see Lemma 3.3. For convergence to Poisson (i.e. a lower-dimensional manifold in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ ), we require only the highest order term,  $G_1$ . In Section 3.3, we first give a characterization of mixed Poisson random measures in Lemma 3.8 and use this in order to show that the limit of occupation measures  $\Gamma_{X^N}$  is concentrated on Poisson distributions using some martingale arguments; see Proposition 3.7. Then, in Section 3.4, we use these results in order to show convergence of  $(\rho_1(X^N))_{N=1,2,\dots}$ ; see Proposition 3.9. Finally, in Section 3.5 we collect all insights to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

#### 3.1 Notation and basics

**Definition 3.1** (Moments, generating functions, state space). *1. We identify a probability measure  $x$  on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  with the sequence  $(x_0, x_1, \dots)$  of its weights. For  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , we denote by*

$$\rho_j(x) := \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} k \cdots (k-j+1) x_k$$

*the  $j$ th factorial moment of  $x$ . In particular,  $\rho_1(x)$  is the mean of  $x$ . We put*

$$\psi_s(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x_k (1-s)^k, \quad s \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.1)$$

*2. The state space of  $X^N$  is*

$$E_N := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : Nx_k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

*Clearly, all the  $E_N$  are subsets of*

$$E := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \rho_1(x) < \infty \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

*3. We write*

$$\mathcal{POI} := \{ \text{Poi}(\lambda) : 0 \leq \lambda < \infty \} \quad (3.4)$$

for the set of Poisson distributions on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ .

**Remark 3.2.** 1. For  $x \in E$  all of whose moments are finite we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_n(x) &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} k(k-1)\cdots(k-n+1)x_k = (-1)^n \frac{\partial^n \psi_s(x)}{\partial s^n} \Big|_{s=0}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \\ \psi_s(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1-s)^k x_k = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho_n(x) \frac{(-s)^n}{n!}, \quad s \in [0, 1],\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

where the last equality holds provided the series converges (which is certainly true for  $x \in E_N$  or  $x \in \mathcal{POL}$ ).

2. An  $x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  equals  $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$  if either of the following conditions (i) or (ii) is satisfied:

$$(i) \quad \psi_s(x) = e^{-\lambda s}, \quad s \in [0, 1] \quad (ii) \quad \rho_n(x) = \lambda^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

In particular we will make use of the fact that  $\rho_2(x) - \rho_1^2(x) = 0$  for  $x \in \mathcal{POL}$ .

### 3.2 Analysing the generator of $X^N$

We will now analyse the generator  $G^N$  of  $X^N$ . Using the jump rates from (1.1), we find for  $f : E_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $e_m$  the  $m$ th unit vector,

$$G^N f(x) = \frac{N^2}{2} \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \binom{k+l}{m} 2^{-(k+l)} (f(x + (e_m - e_n)/N) - f(x)).\tag{3.6}$$

We start with a simple observation.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let  $G^N$  be as in (3.6) and  $f$  be of the form  $f(x) = g(\rho_1(x))$  for some  $g \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , thus  $f$  only depends on the first moment of  $x$ . Then,

$$G^N g(\rho_1(x)) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1(x) + \frac{3}{4}\rho_2(x) - \frac{3}{4}\rho_1^2(x))g''(\rho_1(x)) + o(1).$$

**Remark 3.4.** Remember that we are going to show that the limit of  $X^N(t)$  is mixed Poisson for all  $t > 0$ , which implies that  $\rho_2(X^N(t)) \approx \rho_1^2(X^N(t))$ . This, together with the lemma, already suggests that

$$\int_0^t G^N g(\rho_1(X_s^N)) ds \approx \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \rho_1(X_s^N) g''(\rho_1(X_s^N)) ds,$$

i.e. the limit of  $\rho_1(X^N)$  (if it exists) satisfies  $dZ = ZdW$ , as claimed in Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Since

$$g(\rho_1(x + (e_m - e_n)/N)) = g(\rho_1(x)) + N^{-1}g'(\rho_1(x))(m-n) + \frac{1}{2}g''(\rho_1(x))N^{-2}(m-n)^2 + o(N^{-2}),$$

Copy number variation of genetic elements

we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 G^N &= NG_1 + G_0 + o(1), \\
 G_1g(\rho_1(x)) &= \frac{1}{2}g'(\rho_1(x)) \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \binom{k+l}{m} 2^{-(k+l)}(m-n) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}g'(\rho_1(x)) \left( \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \frac{k+l}{2} \underbrace{\sum_m \binom{k+l-1}{m-1} 2^{-(k+l-1)}}_{=1} - \sum_n n x_n \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}g'(\rho_1(x)) \left( \sum_k x_k \frac{k}{2} + \sum_l x_l \frac{l}{2} - \sum_n n x_n \right) = 0, \\
 G_0g(\rho_1(x)) &= \frac{1}{4}g''(\rho_1(x)) \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \binom{k+l}{m} 2^{-(k+l)} \\
 &\quad \cdot (m(m-1) + n(n-1) - 2mn + m + n) \\
 &= \frac{1}{4}g''(\rho_1(x)) \left( \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \underbrace{\frac{(k+l)(k+l-1)}{4}}_{=(k(k-1)+l(l-1)+2kl)/4} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_n n(n-1)x_n - 2\rho_1^2(x) + 2\rho_1(x) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{4}g''(\rho_1(x)) \left( \frac{1}{2}\rho_2(x) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_1^2(x) + \rho_2(x) - 2\rho_1^2(x) + 2\rho_1(x) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}g''(\rho(x)) \left( \rho_1(x) + \frac{3}{4}\rho_2(x) - \frac{3}{4}\rho_1^2(x) \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

Now we analyse the structure of  $G^N$  by collecting terms for the same powers in  $N$ , when using products of  $\psi_s$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $G^N$  be as in (3.6). For  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $s := (s_1, \dots, s_\ell) \in [0, 1]^\ell$ , set*

$$f_s(x) := \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_i}(x). \quad (3.7)$$

Then there exist operators  $G_1, G_0, G_{-1}, \dots$  obeying the recursions

$$\begin{aligned}
 G^N f_s(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} N^{2-i} G_{2-i} f_s(x), \\
 G_{2-i} f_s(x) &= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) G_{2-i} f_{(s_j)_{j \in J}},
 \end{aligned}$$

and if  $\ell = i$ , then

$$G_{2-i} f_s(x) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}} (-1)^{\ell-|K|} \psi_{(1-(1-s_K))/2}^2(x) \psi_{1-(1-s_{K^c})}(x),$$

where we have set  $(1-s_K) := \prod_{j \in K} (1-s_j)$  and  $K^c := \{1, \dots, \ell\} \setminus K$ . In particular,

$$2G_1 f_s(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left( \psi_{s_j/2}^2(x) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(x) - \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(x) \right). \quad (3.8)$$

## Copy number variation of genetic elements

*Proof.* We obtain, collecting terms proportional to  $N^{2-i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 G^N f_s(x) &= \frac{N^2}{2} \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,\ell} x_k x_\ell \binom{k+\ell}{m} 2^{-(k+\ell)} \\
 &\quad \cdot \left( \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \underbrace{\left( \psi_{s_i}(x) + N^{-1}((1-s_i)^m - (1-s_i)^n) \right)}_{=\psi_{s_i}(x+(e_m-e_n)/N)} - f_s(x) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,\ell} x_k x_\ell \binom{k+\ell}{m} 2^{-(k+\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} N^{2-i} \\
 &\quad \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \prod_{j \in J} ((1-s_j)^m - (1-s_j)^n) \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} N^{2-i} G_{2-i} f_s(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
 2G_{2-i} f_s(x) &:= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) \sum_{m,n} x_n \sum_{k,\ell} x_k x_\ell \binom{k+\ell}{m} 2^{-(k+\ell)} \prod_{j \in J} ((1-s_j)^m - (1-s_j)^n) \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) \sum_{K \subseteq J} (-1)^{|J \setminus K|} \sum_{k,\ell,m} x_k x_\ell \binom{k+\ell}{m} 2^{-(k+\ell)} \left( \prod_{j \in K} (1-s_j) \right)^m \\
 &\quad \cdot \sum_n x_n \left( \prod_{j \in J \setminus K} (1-s_j) \right)^n \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) \sum_{K \subseteq J} (-1)^{|J \setminus K|} \sum_{k,\ell} x_k x_\ell \left( \frac{1 + \prod_{j \in K} (1-s_j)}{2} \right)^{k+\ell} \\
 &\quad \cdot \psi_{1 - \prod_{j \in J \setminus K} (1-s_j)}(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have expanded the last product in the first line for the second equality, and have taken the sum over  $m$  in the third equality. Continuing, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) \sum_{K \subseteq J} (-1)^{|J \setminus K|} \psi_{(1-(1-s_K))/2}^2(x) \psi_{1-(1-s_{J \setminus K})}(x) \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ |J|=i}} \left( \prod_{j \notin J} \psi_{s_j}(x) \right) 2G_{2-i} f_{(s_j)_{j \in J}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the last equality follows from inspecting  $G_{2-i} f_{(s_j)_{j \in J}}$ . From the form of  $G_{2-i}$ , we see that  $G_{2-i} f_s = 0$  if  $\ell < i$  (since there is no  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  with  $|J| = i$  and the outer sum is empty).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6** (Uniform bounds on second moments). *For  $N$  large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_t^N) + \rho_1^2(X_t^N)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\rho_1(X_0^N)]t + \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_0^N) + 3\rho_1^2(X_0^N)].$$



*Proof.* We start with using Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.3 in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G^N \rho_2(x) &= \frac{d^2}{ds^2} G^N \psi_s(x) \Big|_{s=0} = \frac{N}{2} \frac{d^2}{ds^2} (\psi_{s/2}^2(x) - \psi_s(x)) \Big|_{s=0} \\ &= \frac{N}{2} (\frac{1}{2} \rho_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} \rho_2(x) - \rho_2(x)) = \frac{N}{4} (\rho_1^2(x) - \rho_2(x)), \\ G^N \rho_1^2(x) &= \rho_1(x) + \frac{3}{4} (\rho_2(x) - \rho_1^2(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two equations, we see that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_t^N) - \rho_1^2(X_t^N)] = -\frac{N+3}{4} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_t^N) - \rho_1^2(X_t^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1(X_t^N)].$$

Since  $(\rho_1(X_t^N))_{t \geq 0}$  is a martingale, we have  $z := \mathbb{E}[\rho_1(X_t^N)]$ , and we can solve this ODE by

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_t^N) - \rho_1^2(X_t^N)] = e^{-(N+3)t/2} (\rho_2(X^N(0)) - \rho_1^2(X^N(0))) + (1 - e^{-(N+3)t/2}) \frac{2}{N+3} z.$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_t^N) + \rho_1^2(X_t^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_0^N) + \rho_1^2(X_0^N)] &= \int_0^t (z - \frac{N-3}{4} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_s^N) - \rho_1^2(X_s^N)]) ds \\ &= zt - (\frac{N-3}{2(N+3)} (1 - e^{-(N+3)t/2})) (\rho_2(X_0^N) - \rho_1^2(X_0^N)) \\ &\quad - \frac{N-3}{2(N+3)} z (t - \frac{2}{N+3} (1 - e^{-(N+3)t/2})), \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows by considering large  $N$ . □

### 3.3 Mixed Poisson random measures

Recall from (1.4) the occupation measure  $\Gamma_{X^N}$  of  $X^N$  (which is a random probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ ). We will show in this section:

**Proposition 3.7.** *The sequence  $(\Gamma_{X^N})_{N=1,2,\dots}$  is tight. Any limit point  $\Gamma$  is concentrated on the set of Poisson distributions, in the sense that  $\Gamma([0, \infty) \times \mathcal{POI}) = 1$ . In addition, if according to the assumptions of Theorem 1.1,  $\sup_N \rho_2(X^N(0)) \leq C < \infty$ , then*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-s} |\rho_2(X_s^N) - \rho_1^2(X_s^N)| ds = \int |\rho_2(x) - \rho_1^2(x)| \Gamma_{X^N}(ds, dx) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (3.9)$$

We prepare the proof of this proposition by a characterization of mixed Poisson random measures on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ .

**Lemma 3.8** (Characterization of mixed Poisson distributions). *Let  $\psi_s$  and  $\rho_n$  be as in Definition 3.1. Let  $X$  be a  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ -valued random variable with  $\rho_1(X) < \infty$  almost surely. Then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $X$  has the same distribution as  $\text{Poi}(\rho_1(X))$ .
2.  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \psi_s(X)} | \rho_1(X)] = \exp(-\lambda e^{-s \rho_1(X)})$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ .
3. For all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_{s_1}(X) \cdots \psi_{s_n}(X) | \rho_1(X)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \psi_{s_j/2}^2(X) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n \psi_{s_k}(X) | \rho_1(X) \right].$$

*Proof.* 1.  $\Rightarrow$  3. : By assumption we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_{s_1}(X) \cdots \psi_{s_n}(X) | \rho_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-(s_1 + \cdots + s_n)\rho_1(X)} | \rho_1(X)] = e^{-(s_1 + \cdots + s_n)\rho_1(X)}.$$

Since the right hand side only depends on  $s_1 + \cdots + s_n$ , the result follows from taking expectations and summing in

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_{s_1}(X) \cdots \psi_{s_n}(X) | \rho_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_{s_j/2}^2(X) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n \psi_{s_k}(X) | \rho_1(X)\right].$$

3.  $\Rightarrow$  2. : We start with the following observation: Let  $(s_{kj})_{k=1,2,\dots,j=1,\dots,k}$  be asymptotically negligible (in the sense that  $\sup_j |s_{kj}| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$ ) and  $\sum_{j=1}^k s_{kj} = s$ . Then, since

$$\psi_{s_{kj}}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} X_i (1 - s_{kj})^i = 1 - (s_{kj} + o(s_{kj})) \sum_i i X_i,$$

we have

$$\log\left(\prod_{j=1}^k \psi_{s_{kj}}(X)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 - (s_{kj} + o(s_{kj}))\rho_1(X)) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} -s\rho_1(X). \quad (3.10)$$

Now, we come to proving the assertion: Fix  $s \in [0, 1]$  and  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and let  $\Pi_k$  be a random partition of  $[0, ns]$  with  $k$  elements, which arises iteratively as follows: Starting with  $\Pi_n = \{[0, s], [s, 2s], \dots, [(n-1)s, ns]\}$ , let  $\Pi_{k+1}$  arise from  $\Pi_k$  by randomly taking one partition element  $[a, b]$  from  $\Pi_k$ , and adding the two elements  $[a, (a+b)/2]$  and  $[(a+b)/2, b]$  to  $\Pi_{k+1}$ . (For  $n = 1$ , we can e.g. have  $\Pi_1 = \{[0, s]\}$ ,  $\Pi_2 = \{[0, s/2], [s/2, s]\}$ ,  $\Pi_3 = \{[0, s/4], [s/4, s/2], [s/2, s]\}$ ,  $\Pi_4 = \{[0, s/4], [s/4, 3s/8], [3s/8, s/2], [s/2, s]\}$ , ...). From 3., we find

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_s^n(X) | \rho_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{\pi \in \Pi_n} \psi_{|\pi|}(X) | \rho_1(X)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}} \psi_{|\pi|}(X) | \rho_1(X)\right],$$

since the expectation of the right hand side also runs over the  $n$  possible random partitions  $\Pi_{n+1}$ , which arise by splitting one element of length  $s$  into two elements of length  $s/2$ . It is not hard to see that – almost surely – every partition element in  $\Pi_k$  eventually gets split in two, so  $\{|\pi| : \pi \in \Pi_k\}$  is asymptotically negligible as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,  $\prod_{\pi \in \Pi_k} \psi_{|\pi|}(X) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{-ns\rho_1(X)}$  almost surely as in (3.10), so we see using dominated convergence that

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_s^n(X) | \rho_1(X)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{\pi \in \Pi_k} \psi_{|\pi|}(X) | \rho_1(X)\right] = e^{-ns\rho_1(X)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\psi_s(X)} | \rho_1(X)] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\lambda)^n}{n!} e^{-ns\rho_1(X)} = e^{-\lambda e^{-s\rho_1(X)}}.$$

2. $\Rightarrow$ 1.: Conditional on  $\rho_1(X)$ , we see that  $\psi_s(X) = e^{-s\rho_1(X)}$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$ , which means that  $X \sim \text{Poi}(\rho_1(X))$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.7.* We observe that  $\rho_1(X^N)$  is a non-negative martingale by Lemma 3.3, and hence satisfies the compact containment condition by Doob's maximal inequality. Using Lemma A.1, together with Remark A.3, we see that  $(\Gamma_{X^N})_{N=1,2,\dots}$  is tight.

Then, recall  $f_s$  from (3.7) and choose  $g$  bounded and smooth. We are going to argue using the martingale

$$\left( N^{-1}g(\rho_1(X^N(t)))f_s(X^N(t)) - \int_0^t N^{-1}G^N g(\rho_1(X^N(r)))f_s(X^N(r))dr \right)_{t \geq 0}. \quad (3.11)$$

As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we find that  $N^{-1}g(\rho_1(X^N(t)))f_s(X^N(t)) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$  since  $g$  and  $f_s$  are bounded. Moreover, from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5,

$$N^{-1}G^N g(\rho_1(x))f_s(x) = g(\rho_1(x))G_1 f_s(x) + O(N^{-1}),$$

and  $G_1 f_s$  is given by (3.8). Therefore, multiplying (3.11) by  $2/\ell$  and taking  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we find that for any weak limit  $\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma_{X^N}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  that

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \left( \int_0^t e^r \left( g(\rho_1(x)) \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left( \psi_{s_j/2}^2(x) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq \ell}}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(x) - \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(x) \right) \right) \Gamma(dr, dx) \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

is a martingale with continuous paths and vanishing quadratic variation, hence vanishes. So, for  $X \sim \bar{\Gamma}$  with  $\bar{\Gamma}(dx) = \Gamma([0, \infty), dx)$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[ g(\rho_1(X)) \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_j/2}^2(X) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq \ell}}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(X) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ g(\rho_1(X)) \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(X) \right],$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_j/2}^2(X) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq \ell}}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(X) \right) | \rho_1(X) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \psi_{s_k}(X) | \rho_1(X) \right]$$

since  $g$  was arbitrary. From Lemma 3.8, we see that  $\bar{\Gamma}$  must be concentrated on mixed Poisson measures. Finally, for (3.9), consider a probability space with  $Y^N \sim \bar{\Gamma}_{X^N}$ ,  $Y \sim \bar{\Gamma}_X$  and  $Y^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} Y$  almost surely. Since  $\mathbb{E}[\rho_2(Y^N) + \rho_1^2(Y^N)] = \int_0^\infty e^{-s} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2(X_s^N) + \rho_1^2(X_s^N)] ds < \infty$  by Corollary 3.6, we see by the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-s} |\rho_2(X_s^N) - \rho_1^2(X_s^N)| ds \right] = \mathbb{E}[|\rho_2(Y^N) - \rho_1^2(Y^N)|] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|\rho_2(Y) - \rho_1^2(Y)|] = 0,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.4 Convergence of $\rho_1(X^N)$

We will now show tightness of  $(\rho_1(X^N))_{N=1,2,\dots}$ , using the criterion of Aldous and Rebolledo; see Appendix B. Uniqueness of the corresponding martingale problem is immediate, as we will see.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let, according to the assumptions of Theorem 1.1,  $\rho_1(X^N(0)) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} z$  and  $\sup_N \rho_2(X^N(0)) \leq C < \infty$ . Then,  $\rho_1(X^N) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} Z$ , where  $Z$  solves  $Z(0) = z$  and (1.2) holds.*

*Proof.* For tightness of  $(\rho_1(X^N))_{N=1,2,\dots}$ , we use the Aldous-Rebolledo criterion; see Appendix B. We find from Lemma 3.3 that these processes are non-negative martingales and have quadratic variation processes  $M^1, M^2, \dots$  with

$$M^N(t) = \int_0^t \rho_1(X^N(s)) + \frac{3}{2} (\rho_2(X^N(s)) - \rho_1^2(X^N(s))) ds.$$

By Doob's martingale inequality we find that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $C_\varepsilon < \infty$  with

$$\sup_N \mathbb{P}(\rho_1(X^N) > C_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon.$$

In particular, this implies that  $(\rho_1(X^N(t)))_{N=1,2,\dots}$  is tight for all  $t \geq 0$ , i.e. Assumption 1 in Proposition B.1 holds. For 2., take a sequence  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$  of stopping times, choose  $\delta := \varepsilon/(2C_\varepsilon)$  and write, using Proposition 3.7

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq \theta \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tau_N}^{\tau_N + \theta} \rho_1(X^N(s)) + \frac{3}{2}(\rho_2(X^N(s)) - \rho_1^2(X^N(s))) ds > \varepsilon\right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tau_N}^{\tau_N + \delta} \rho_1(X^N(s)) ds > \varepsilon/2\right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}\left[\int_0^T |\rho_2(X^N(s)) - \rho_1^2(X^N(s))| ds > \varepsilon/2\right] \\ & \leq \sup_N \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho_1(X^N(t)) > \varepsilon/(2\delta)\right) \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

For proving uniqueness, from the quadratic variation above, any weak limit  $Z$  of  $(\rho_1(X^N))_{N=1,2,\dots}$  must be a martingale with quadratic variation  $\int_0^\cdot Z_s ds$ . The solution of (1.2) is the only such process and we are done.  $\square$

### 3.5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

All assertions follow from Propositions 3.9 and 3.7.

## A Random measures on $\mathbb{N}_0$

Here, in order to be self-contained, we recall a basic relative-compactness criterion for  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ , the space of probability measures on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ . Recall that  $\rho_1(x) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty kx_k$  is the first moment of some  $x = (x_k)_{k=0,1,\dots} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ . Note that we use the topology of weak convergence on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ , as well as the corresponding weak convergence on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ . Recall that this topology is separable and induced by a complete metric; see e.g. Etheridge (2001). In particular, we can use Prohorov's Theorem (see e.g. Section 3.2 in Ethier and Kurtz (1986)).

**Lemma A.1** (Tightness criterion on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  and on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ ). *1. For any  $C > 0$ , the set*

$$K_C := \{x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \rho_1(x) \leq C\}$$

*is relatively compact.*

*2. Let  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ . If for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \Gamma} \mathbb{P}(K_{C_\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon,$$

*then  $\Gamma$  is relatively compact.*

*Proof.* 1. For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we choose  $N \geq C/\varepsilon$ . We write, using the Markov inequality,

$$\sup \left\{ \sum_{k=N}^\infty x_k : x \in K_C \right\} \leq \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^\infty kx_k : x \in K_C \right\} \leq \frac{C}{N} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, we have shown that  $K_C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  is tight, and the result follows from Prohorov's Theorem. Assertion 2 now follows from 1. by a direct applications of Prohorov's Theorem.  $\square$

**Remark A.2.** Let us reformulate 2. from the above lemma in terms of random probability measures. Here, a family of random probability measures  $(X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  is tight, provided that the family of first moments,  $(\rho_1(X_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ , is tight (as a set of real-valued random variables).

**Remark A.3** (Tightness of occupation measures). Since the occupation measure from (1.4) is an element of

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{exp}}([0, \infty) \times E) := \{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}([0, \infty) \times E) : \mathbb{P}(dt, E) = e^{-t} dt\}$$

(with  $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  from (3.3)), we need to transform the assertion of Lemma A.1 to the tightness in  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{exp}}([0, \infty) \times E)$ . For  $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{exp}}([0, \infty) \times E)$ , we define  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(dx) := \mathbb{P}([0, \infty), dx)$ . Then,  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{exp}}([0, \infty) \times E)$  is relatively compact if and only if  $\{\bar{\mathbb{P}} : \mathbb{P} \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$  is relatively compact. For the latter, we can use Lemma A.1.

## B The Aldous-Rebolledo criterion for tightness

We briefly recall the Aldous-Rebolledo criterion for tightness in  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ , see e.g. Theorem 1.17 in Etheridge (2001). Recall that  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  is the space of càdàg-functions from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , equipped with the Skorohod topology.

**Proposition B.1.** *Let  $Y^1, Y^2, \dots$  be a sequence of (real-valued) martingales with paths in  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  and quadratic variation processes  $M^1, M^2, \dots$ . This sequence is relatively compact in the weak topology of probability measures on  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  provided that:*

1. *For all  $t \geq 0$ , the sequence  $Y^1(t), Y^2(t), \dots$  is tight, and*
2. *for every sequence  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$  of stopping times, bounded by  $T < \infty$  and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that*

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq \theta \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}(M^N(\tau_N + \theta) - M^N(\tau_N) > \varepsilon) < \varepsilon.$$

## Acknowledgements

We thank Peter Czappon, Jonathan Henshaw and Judith Korb for discussions concerning the dynamics of transposable elements. PP is partly supported by the Freiburg Center for data analysis and modeling (FDM). AW is partly supported by DFG SPP 1590.

## References

- Berglund, N. and B. Gentz (2006). *Noise-induced phenomena in slow-fast dynamical systems: a sample-paths approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bourque, G., K. H. Burns, M. Gehring, V. Gorbunova, A. Seluanov, M. Hammell, M. Imbeault, Z. Izsvák, H. L. Levin, T. S. Macfarlan, D. L. Mager, and C. Feschotte (2018, 11). Ten things you should know about transposable elements. *Genome Biol* 19(1), 199.
- Chang, J. (1999). Recent common ancestors of all present-day individuals. *J. Appl. Probab.* 31, 1002–1026.
- Coron, C. and Y. Le Jan (2020). Genetics of the biparental moran model. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.15479>.
- Etheridge, A. (2001). *An introduction to superprocesses*. American Mathematical Society.
- Ethier, S. N. and T. G. Kurtz (1986). *Markov Processes. Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley, New York.
- Griffiths, R. C. and P. Marjoram (1997). An ancestral recombination graph. In *Progress in population genetics and human evolution (Minneapolis, MN, 1994)*, Volume 87 of IMA Vol. Math. Appl., pp. 257–270. Springer, New York.

## Copy number variation of genetic elements

- Katzenberger, G. S. (1991). Solutions of a stochastic differential equation forced onto a manifold by a large drift. *Ann. Probab.* 19, 1587–1628.
- Kurtz, T. G. (1991). Random time changes and convergence in distribution under the Meyer-Zheng conditions. *Ann. Probab.* 19, 1010–1034.
- Kurtz, T. G. (1992). Averaging for martingale problems and stochastic approximation. In *Applied stochastic analysis (New Brunswick, NJ, 1991)*, Volume 177 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pp. 186–209. Berlin: Springer.
- Meyer, P.-A. and W. A. Zheng (1984). Tightness criteria for laws of semimartingales. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 20, 353–372.
- Pardoux, E. and A. Y. Veretennikov (2001). On Poisson equation and diffusion approximation 1. *Ann. Probab.* 29, 1061–1085.
- Rohde, D. L., S. Olson, and J. T. Chang (2004, Sep). Modelling the recent common ancestry of all living humans. *Nature* 431(7008), 562–566.
- Sawyer, S. A. and D. L. Hartl (1992, Dec). Population genetics of polymorphism and divergence. *Genetics* 132(4), 1161–1176.
- Sethupathy, P. and S. Hannenhalli (2008). A tutorial of the poisson random field model in population genetics. *Adv Bioinformatics* 4, 257864.
- Wakeley, J., L. King, B. S. Low, and S. Ramachandran (2012, Apr). Gene genealogies within a fixed pedigree, and the robustness of Kingman’s coalescent. *Genetics* 190(4), 1433–1445.
- Wakeley, J., L. King, and P. R. Wilton (2016, 07). Effects of the population pedigree on genetic signatures of historical demographic events. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113(29), 7994–8001.