

IRREVERSIBLE EVOLUTION, OBSTACLES IN FITNESS LANDSCAPES AND PERSISTENT DRUG RESISTANCE

KRISTINA CRONA

ABSTRACT. We use fitness graphs, or directed cube graphs, for analyzing evolutionary reversibility. The main application is antimicrobial drug resistance. Reversible drug resistance has been observed both clinically and experimentally. If drug resistance depends on a single point mutation, then a possible scenario is that the mutation reverts back to the wild-type codon after the drug has been discontinued, so that susceptibility is fully restored. In general, a drug pause does not automatically imply fast elimination of drug resistance. Also if drug resistance is reversible, the threshold concentration for reverse evolution may be lower than for forward evolution. For a theoretical understanding of evolutionary reversibility, including threshold asymmetries, it is necessary to analyze obstacles in fitness landscapes. We compare local and global obstacles, obstacles for forward and reverse evolution, and conjecture that favorable landscapes for forward evolution correlate with evolution being reversible. Both suboptimal peaks and plateaus are analyzed with some observations on the impact of redundancy and dimensionality. Our findings are compared with laboratory studies on irreversible malarial drug resistance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Penicillin was introduced on a large scale 1940 and the spread of penicillin resistance was documented already in 1942 (Lobanovska and Pilla, 2017). The development of antimicrobial drug resistance is an evolutionary process, and so is the reverse adaptation back to the drug-free environment. Reverse evolution that restores the original genotype has been observed for HIV patients (Castro et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2015), and in experiments for other pathogens (Bjorkman et al., 2000). However, expectations of fast reversal of antimicrobial resistance after a drug pause have not always been realized. Failures to restore susceptibility includes nation-wide long term programs (Sundqvist et al., 2010; Enne et al., 2001).

Costly drug resistance is not likely to persist in a drug-free environment. If the original wild-type is available then regrowth may restore susceptibility (no evolution is necessary). In addition to extinction and reversion, a possible fate for a resistant genotype is that new mutations accumulate, sometimes referred to as compensatory mutations. Such mutations decrease the cost of resistance in the drug free environment, and there is usually an impact on susceptibility as well.

Evolution is described as genotypically irreversible if the population cannot adapt back to the original genotype, and phenotypically irreversible if it cannot adapt back to the original phenotype. Because of genetic redundancy in the sense that different sequences code for the same phenotype, evolution can be phenotypically reversible

even if it is genotypically irreversible (Kaltenback, 2015). An extensive laboratory study on costly drug resistance for 12 different antibiotics showed partly successful adaptation to the drug free environment through compensatory mutations (Dunai et al., 2019). However, neither the original genotype, nor the phenotype, was restored for any of the drugs, and in most cases the new genotypes had clearly lower fitness than the original wild-type. In contrast, for some experiments of similar type the original genotype was restored in the majority of the trials (Bjorkman et. al, 2000), or at least in some proportion of the trials (Maisnier-Patin et al., 2002; Nagaev et al., 2001). If the original genotype cannot be restored in experiments, the reason could be that evolution is genotypically irreversible. Another possible explanation is that an abundance of available compensatory mutations make genotypic reversion unlikely. For more background, reversal of drug and pesticide resistance is reviewed in Allen et al. (2017).

Here, the main topic is genotypically irreversible evolution and obstacles that cause irreversibility. For a thorough analysis it is useful to consider fitness landscapes. In brief, the fitness of a genotype is a measure of its expected contribution to the next generation. A fitness landscape assigns a fitness value w_g , i.e., a non-negative number, to each genotype g . Fitness can be thought of as a height coordinate in the landscape. The level of drug resistance approximates fitness for a pathogen under drug exposure.

Throughout the paper we consider fitness landscapes for biallelic L -locus systems. For instance, if $L = 2$ the genotypes are represented as 00, 10, 01 and 11, where 00 denotes the wild-type. According to conventional assumptions, the evolutionary process for a population can be represented as a walk in the landscape where each step increases the height, i.e., the process consists of a sequence of single point mutations $0 \mapsto 1$ or $1 \mapsto 0$ such that each mutation increases fitness. Unless otherwise stated, no two genotypes have the same fitness. A genotype g is defined as a peak if all its mutational neighbors (genotypes that differ from g at a single locus) have lower fitness than g .

For an overview of evolutionary potential it is convenient to use fitness graphs (Figure 1). A fitness graph is a directed L -cube graph such that each edge is directed toward the genotype of higher fitness. A path in the graph that respects the arrows is referred to as an accessible evolutionary path.

Both forward evolution from the wild-type 00 to 11 and reverse evolution from 11 to 00 are straight forward for the fitness graphs in Figure 1 (the peaks are marked red). Mutations can accumulate in any order in the new environment, and the same is true back in the original environment. The graph 2A is less favorable than 1A, since only one trajectory is accessible from 00 to 11, and 2B has no accessible trajectory from 00 to 11. For general L , the most favorable fitness graph is similar to Figure 1. Informally the landscape is represented by an "all arrows up" graph.

The obstacles displayed in Figure 2 depend on epistasis, or gene interactions. The three fitness graphs have sign epistasis, i.e., the sign of the effect of a mutation, whether positive or negative, depends on background. The graph 2B, characterized by two




FIGURE 1. The fitness graph for the new environment (A) is favorable since mutations can accumulate in any order, i.e., both trajectories from the wild-type 00 to 11 are accessible. Reverse evolution from 11 to 00 is also straight forward (B).




FIGURE 2. Three graphs with sign epistasis. The graph B and all two locus subsystems of C have reciprocal sign epistasis. Both B and C are Haldane graphs, i.e., they represent fitness landscapes such that 50 percent of the genotypes are peaks.

peaks, is said to have reciprocal sign epistasis. For Graph 2B and C every other genotype is a peak and the same construction works for any L (Haldane, 1931). The graphs with 50 % peak density are called Haldane graphs (see also Crona et al. (2023)).

Note that in the absence of sign epistasis the fitness graph can always be described as an all arrows up graph. For more background, sign epistasis was introduced in Weinreich et al. (2005) and early work on sign epistasis, fitness graphs and related rank order based concepts includes Poelwijk et al. (2007); De Visser et al. (2009); Poelwijk et al. (2011); Crona et al. (2013), see also Crona (2014). A main topic concerns the relation between local properties (such as reciprocal sign epistasis) and global properties (such as peaks in the global fitness landscapes), with recent progress in Riehl et al. (2022); Saona et al. (2022).

All arrows up graph and Haldane graphs are, in a sense, opposite extremes. For the sake of completeness, in addition to all arrows up graph there a second - perhaps

more exotic - type of fitness landscapes that implies straight forward evolution. If one assumes that the fitness is capped at some number M in a landscape, and that all genotypes have several neighbors with fitness M , then adaptation is not difficult. From any starting point there exists a single point mutation that results in maximal fitness. A slightly more general concept is convenient. We define a fitness landscape as a *hop-to-top landscape* if fitness is capped at some number M , and if for (almost) all genotypes, there is a short accessible path to a genotype of fitness $M(1 - \epsilon)$, where ϵ is some small number.

For instance, a hop-to-top landscape can be constructed by drawing fitness values from a uniform distribution between 0 and M , and assign fitness randomly to genotypes. For $L = 10,000$ a genotype is then expected to have 100 neighbors with fitness at least $0.99M$. Under the same assumption for the landscape except that L is slightly smaller, one still gets a hop-to-top landscape, whereas a sufficiently low L -value results in an unfavorable landscape (both claims are easy to verify). It has been proposed that similar constructions (for large L) are relevant for speciation (Gavrilets, 1997), see also the result section.

Haldane graphs, all arrows up graphs and hop-to-top landscapes are theoretical constructions that can be used as a starting point for discussing obstacles in fitness landscapes and evolutionary reversibility. However, few empirical fitness landscapes have proved to belong to the extremes. Obstacles have to be considered in more general settings.

From a fitness landscape for antimicrobial drug resistance one can determine if evolution is reversible. Whether or not reversion is plausible depends on other factors as well, including population size and mutation frequency (Pennings et al., 2022; Maisnier-Patin et al., 2002). Such factors will not be discussed here. Neither will we discuss more elaborate methods for restoring the original wild-type that depends on sequences of drugs (Mira et al., 2015; Goulart et al., 2013; Tran and Yang., 2017).

2. RESULTS

A case of Irreversible malarial drug resistance was identified in the study Ogbunugafor and Hartl (2016). Several drug concentrations were considered in the study. Figure 3 shows the fitness graph for the highest drug concentration, and Figure 4 for the drug-free environment. The genotype 1111 is the global peak and 0000 has the lowest fitness in Figure 3, whereas 0000 is the global peak in Figure 4. As clear from Figure 4, there is no accessible path from 1111 to 0000. Consequently evolution is irreversible. (It is of course theoretically possible that a longer accessible path from 1111 to 0000 exists that includes new mutations in addition to the reversions.) We will return to the example repeatedly throughout the paper.

Section 2.1 and 2.2 analyze suboptimal peaks and plateaus in fitness landscapes, Sections 2.3 discusses reversibility, and Section 2.4 reversibility and the impact of fluctuating drug concentrations.




FIGURE 3. The 16 genotypes represent all combinations of four mutations that individually increase malarial drug resistance. The genotype 1111 is the global peak and the wild-type 0000 has the lowest fitness in the drug environment. There are several accessible paths from 0000 to 1111.




FIGURE 4. The genotype 0000 is the global peak, whereas 1111 has low fitness in the drug-free environment. Evolution is irreversible since there is no accessible path from the genotype 1111 to 0000

2.1. **Suboptimal peaks.** The most simple example of a suboptimal peak arises if a double mutant with higher fitness than the wild-type combines two detrimental single mutations (Figure 2B). For general L any two-locus subsystem with reciprocal sign epistasis constitutes a global obstacle if independent of background. For instance, assume

that

$$w_{00s} > w_{11s} > w_{10s}, w_{01s} \quad *$$

for all s of length $L - 2$. Then it is clear that some genotype of the form $g = 11\tilde{s}$ is a suboptimal peak. (Indeed, if $11\tilde{s}$ has maximal fitness among all genotypes of the form $11s$, then $11\tilde{s}$ is a peak with lower fitness than $00\tilde{s}$.)

A variant of the same theme (bad+bad=good), is that the combined effect of replacing two blocks (sets) of loci is positive, whereas the replacement of each block alone is negative. Such a system is sometimes referred to as lock-key system (De Vos et al., 2015) Similar to the condition $*$, local obstacles constitute global obstacles if independent of background.

Definition 2.1. For a block of length $L' < L$, assume that \prec is an order of the genotypes in the L' -locus subsystem. The block is *rank order preserving* if the following condition holds:

$$w_{gs} > w_{g's} \text{ if } g \succ g',$$

for g, g' in the L' -locus subsystem.

The following observation is immediate (and analogous to the implications of $*$).

Observation 2.2. For each peak in a rank order preserving block there is a corresponding peak in the global L -locus system.

Figure 5 illustrates Observation 2.2. The two loci in the middles constitute a rank order preserving block. The four subsystems of the form

$$*00*, *10*, *01*, *11*$$

has reciprocal sign epistasis (marked by blue arrows). Observation 2.2 implies that the two peaks $*00*, *11*$ in the rank order preserving block correspond to two peaks in the global system. The peaks in the global system are 0000 and 0110 .

The key property of rank order preserving blocks holds in a more general setting.

Definition 2.3. For a block of length $L' < L$, assume that \prec is an order of the genotypes in the L' -locus subsystem. A block of length $L' < L$ is a *graph preserving block* if for any two mutational neighbors g and g' in the L' -locus subsystem,

$$w_{gs} > w_{g's} \text{ if } g \succ g'$$

Note that the condition implies that the fitness graph for the L' -locus subsystems defined by the graph preserving block are independent of background (see the four marked subgraphs in Figure 4).

Observation 2.4. For each peak in a graph preserving subsystem, there is a corresponding peak in the global L -locus system.

A closer look at the study of malarial drug resistance for the drug-free environment (Figure 4) reveals a pattern that is very similar to the graph preserving block shown in Figure 5. For an easy comparison, Figure 6 is a copy of Figure 4 with the relevant




FIGURE 5. The subsystems determined by the central block of length 2, marked with blue arrows, have reciprocal sign epistasis on all backgrounds. The obstacle prevents evolution from 1111 to the global peak 0000. All arrows except the blue ones point toward 0000.

arrows marked blue. The arrows agree with Figure 5 except for a single arrow marked red. The red arrow leads directly to a suboptimal peak (the arrow could otherwise have served as an escape). It is "almost true" that a graph preserving block prevents reverse evolution.

As demonstrated, the existence of single graph preserving block with suboptimal peaks implies that there are suboptimal peaks in the global fitness landscape. The following schematic example illustrates the impact of multiple rank order preserving blocks.

Example 2.5. Assume that the genotypes in an L -locus system can be partitioned into blocks consisting of two loci, where for each block (using informal notation) $w_{11} > w_{00} > w_{10} > w_{01}$. For $L = 6$ there are eight peaks:

$$000000, 110000, 001100, 000011, 111100, 110011, 001111, 111111$$

Evolution from 000000 to 111111 requires passing three obstacles, i.e., moving from 00 to 11 for each one of the three blocks. Analogously, for $L = 40$ there are about a million peaks, a billion genotypes, and 20 obstacles. In general, the peak density $2^{-L/2}$ decreases by L . However, it is fair to say that the landscapes are equally (un)favorable for all L since the number of obstacles ($L/2$) is proportional to L .

Observation 2.6. If the peak density decreases by L for a class of fitness landscapes, it does not follow that the landscape becomes more favorable by L .




FIGURE 6. The fitness graph agrees with Figure 4. Similar to Figure 5 all arrows right below genotypes of the form $*11*$ (marked blue) point up, with one exception (marked red). The red arrow leads directly to a suboptimal peak.

Observation 2.7. If the L sequence (the genome) can be partitioned into graph preserving blocks, then the number of peaks equals the product of the number of peaks in each block.

Proof. Let b_1, \dots, b_r be the blocks and assume that b_i has n_i peaks. Let $g = g_1 \dots g_r$ be a genotype such that $g_i \in b_i$. Then g is a peak if and only if each g_i is a peak in the block b_i . Consequently, there are in total $n_1 \times \dots \times n_r$ peaks in the global fitness landscape. \square

Consider the category of fitness landscapes such that the genome can be partitioned into rank order preserving blocks. The block landscapes introduced in Perelson and Macken (1995) belong to the category. Specifically, the landscapes are defined so that each block contributes independently to fitness, and fitness values within blocks are assigned randomly. Observation 2.7 for block landscapes was stated in Schmiegelt and Krug (2014). Landscapes in the category are similar in that obstacles in each block have a global impact (in contrast to for instance hop-to-top landscapes where subsystems with reciprocal sign epistasis have no relevance). For landscapes in the category, the problem of finding the global peak in the L -locus system is equivalent to the combined problem of finding the optimal sequence for each block (as in Example 2.5). It follows that adding blocks, all else equal, does not make the fitness landscapes more favorable.

Fitness landscapes such that the L -sequence can be partitioned into graph order preserving blocks differ substantially from the rank order preserving case. The reason

is that the optimal sequence for a particular block may depend on background. An example is the following 4-locus system.

Example 2.8. Assume that the genotypes in an 4-locus system can be partitioned into blocks consisting of two loci, where 00 and 11 have higher fitness than the intermediates 10 and 01 in each block (again using informal notation). The peaks are

$$0000, 1100, 0011, 1111,$$

Moreover, assume that

$$w_{1111} > w_{0000} > w_{1100} > w_{0011}$$

Evolution from 0000 to 1111 is difficult since both $0000 \mapsto 1100$ and $0000 \mapsto 0011$ decrease fitness.

It is instructive to compare * and other rank order conditions discussed here with conventional models of fitness landscapes. The condition * does obviously not hold in the absence of sign epistasis, in particular not for additive fitness landscapes. The condition * is also incompatible with hop-to-top landscapes constructed by a random-fitness assignment (see the introduction). The reason is that for a random fitness landscape w , the inequality $w_{00s} > w_{10s}$ cannot hold for all s if L is large.

An empirical study uses assumptions similar to the hop-to-top landscapes, i.e., fitness is randomly assigned from a uniform distribution between 0 and 1, for describing worst-case scenarios for adaptation (Greenbury et al., 2022), with the difference that fitness is assigned to phenotypes rather than genotypes. Note that * cannot hold for a random fitness landscape w as described. The reason is that genotypes of the form $00s$ correspond to many phenotypes, and similarly for genotypes $10s$. Consequently there are both s' such that $w_{10s'} > w_{00s'}$ and s'' such that $w_{10s''} < w_{00s''}$. In other words, the assumptions on w are not compatible with * or similar rank order conditions. It follows that random assumptions do not describe worst-case scenarios for fitness landscapes in settings where rank order preserving blocks are important.

2.2. Suboptimal plateaus. Some fitness landscapes have a high degree of redundancy. Consequently, it is of interest to consider landscapes where mutational neighbors are allowed to have the same fitness. Fitness graphs for such landscapes can be drawn similarly to standard fitness graphs, except that some arrows would be replaced by edges.

Definition 2.9. A genotype g belongs to a suboptimal plateau in a fitness landscape if

- (i) All neighbors have the same or lower fitness than g , and
- (ii) at least one genotype in the fitness landscape have higher fitness than g .

For fitness landscapes with a high degree of redundancy, an evolving population may be unable to reach a genotype of high fitness because of suboptimal plateaus. The following example shows the impact of plateaus.

Example 2.10. Assume that an 8-locus system consists of two blocks of 4 loci. The first block is in state 0 for the following eight sequences:

0000, 1000, 0001, 1100, 0110, 1001, 1110, 1101,

and in state 1 for the remaining eight sequences

0100, 0010, 1010, 0101, 0011, 1011, 0111, 1111.

Notice that for any sequence, a single mutation can change the state of the block (from 0 to 1, or from 1 to 0). Assume that the second block has similar properties. Then the 8-locus system has four states 00, 10, 01, 11 determined by the state of each block. If the fitness of a genotype in the 8-locus system is determined its state, then the landscape is analogous to a biallelic 2-locus system.

For instance, if $w_{11} > w_{00} > w_{10} > w_{01}$, where w_{ij} denotes the fitness for the state ij , then the 64 genotypes that represent the state 00 constitute a suboptimal plateau. Neutral mutations are available, but no sequence of neutral mutations result in a genotype such that beneficial mutations are possible.

By using a similar construction, one can obtain a landscape with arbitrary redundancy from a fitness landscape w without redundancy. Specifically, assume that w has s peaks and that no two genotypes have the same fitness. Construct s blocks of r loci, such that 50 percent of the sequences in each block has state 0 and 50 percent state 1, and such that for any sequence a single mutation can change the state. (In the previous example $r = 4$ and $s = 2$. The construction is not more difficult for larger r -values.) If r_1, \dots, r_s represent the states for a genotype in the $L = rs$ -locus system, then one assigns the fitness $w_{r_1 \dots r_s}$ to the genotype. The observation below follows.

Observation 2.11. For every fitness landscape with no redundancy, one can construct an landscape with an arbitrarily high degree of redundancy, such that each suboptimal peak in the first landscape corresponds to a suboptimal plateau in the second landscape.

2.3. Irreversible evolution. If the optimal genotypes for an organism differ between two environments A and B, it is interesting to analyze forward and reverse evolution. The motivating example is costly drug resistance. This section does not include empirical examples, but rather an analysis of small systems from a theoretical point of view.

If the adaptation to a new environment depends on a single point mutation, then evolution is reversible. However, the case $L = 2$ is already more interesting. Assume that 00 is optimal in original environment and 11 in the new environment, so that in a limited sense there is a trade-off between optimal fitness in the two environments. Then there are (in principle) two fitness graphs that allow for forward evolution described by the graphs 1A (all arrows up) and 2A (exactly one arrow down).

Fitness graph 1A for forward evolution: Both paths $00 \mapsto 10 \mapsto 11$ and $00 \mapsto 01 \mapsto 11$ are accessible, i.e., the mutations are beneficial independent of background. In this case it seems plausible that reverse mutations would be beneficial in the original environment (see also the conjecture below).




FIGURE 7. The fitness graph for forward evolution (A) has one accessible trajectory $00 \mapsto 10 \mapsto 11$. The genotype 01 has low fitness in all environments. Evolution is irreversible if the fitness graph for the original environment agrees with B_1 , and reversible if the graph agrees with B_2 .

Fitness graph 2A for forward evolution: By assumption, exactly one path is accessible, described as $00 \mapsto 10 \mapsto 11$. The mutation $0 \mapsto 1$ at the right locus is only beneficial if the left locus is mutated, i.e., there is no independent advantage for the mutation in the new environment. Consequently, the advantage may have nothing to do with the new environment but rather constitute an adjustment because of the left substitution. If that is the case, it seems likely that 11 has higher fitness than 10 *also in the original environment*, which would imply irreversible evolution (the fitness graph would agree with Figure 2B).

Based on the discussion, one can try to relate forward and reverse evolution for $L = 2$. The assumptions are that 11 has highest fitness in the new environment, 00 in the original environment, and that forward evolution is possible (the corresponding fitness graph agrees with 1A or 2A).

Conjecture 1. *Under the assumption stated, there is a correlation between that fitness graph 1A represents forward evolution and that evolution is reversible.*

The conjecture concerns a (possible) statistical correlation, not a general rule. Figure 3 and 4 show six two-locus subsystems that includes 0000. The conjecture applies to the two systems defined by the double mutants 1010 and 0011, respectively. For both systems forward evolution agrees with Figure 1A, and evolution is reversible.

2.4. Irreversible evolution and fluctuating drug concentrations. We continue with assumptions very similar to Section 2.3, except that we consider different drug concentrations. Specifically $L = 2$ and if the drug concentration $C \geq C_T$ for some threshold concentration C_T , then $w_{10} > w_{00}$, otherwise $w_{00} > w_{10}$. For simplicity, we also assume that $w_{11} > w_{10}$ if $C \geq C_T$, so that the path $00 \mapsto 10 \mapsto 11$ is accessible as soon as $C \geq C_T$. The genotype 01 has low fitness in all environments (similar to the second case in Sections 2.3). The relevant graphs are shown in Figure 7, where 7A represents forward evolution and the two alternatives for reverse evolution are 7B1 and 7B2.

Concentration C	Rank order	Peaks
$C \geq C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{10} > w_{00}$	11
$C < C_T$	$w_{00} > w_{10} > w_{11}$	00

TABLE 1. Evolution is reversible. Regardless of drug concentration, there is one peak in the fitness landscape. The fitness graph agrees with B2 for all $C < C_T$.

Concentration C	Rank order	Peaks
$C \geq C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{10} > w_{00}$	11
$C_{\hat{T}} < C < C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{00} > w_{10}$	00 and 11
$C \leq C_{\hat{T}}$	$w_{00} > w_{11} > w_{10}$	00 and 11

TABLE 2. Evolution is irreversible. There are two peaks for all concentrations below the threshold C_T . The rank order of 11 and 00 changes at some threshold concentration $C_{\hat{T}} < C_T$, but the fitness of 10 remains low.

Concentration C	Rank order	Peaks
$C \geq C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{10} > w_{00}$	11
$\hat{C}_T < C < C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{00} > w_{10}$	00 and 11
$C \leq \hat{C}_T$	$w_{00} > w_{10} > w_{11}$	00

TABLE 3. Evolution is reversible. However, the situation is less favorable than the case described by Table 1, since there is a threshold asymmetry. The fitness graph agrees with B1 for $\hat{C}_T < C < C_T$ and with B2 for $C \leq \hat{C}_T$, i.e., the threshold concentration for development of resistance is higher than the threshold for its reversion.

By working with very precise assumptions, one can clearly see some of the mechanisms at play. The prospects for reverse evolution falls naturally into three cases described by the tables 1–3. In brief, the possible outcomes are:

- (i) evolution can be reversed, and the threshold for reverse evolution is the same as for forward evolution (C_T).
- (ii) evolution is irreversible.
- (iii) evolution can be reversed, but the threshold for reverse evolution (\hat{C}_T) is lower than for forward evolution (C_T).

In practical terms, the asymmetry in case (iii) means that resistance can be maintained for drug levels lower than what is necessary for resistance development. However, reverse evolution is possible for a drug-free environment.

The very last case we consider for $L = 2$ (Table 4) falls outside the main topic for the paper because there is no trade-off between fitness for the different environments (and consequently no reason to expect reverse evolution). Rather does the case sorts under cost-free drug resistance. Similar to Tables 1-3, the wild-type 00 has maximal fitness in

Concentration C	Rank order	Peaks
$C \geq C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{10} > w_{00}$	11
$0 < C < C_T$	$w_{11} > w_{00} > w_{10}$	00, 11
$C = 0$	$w_{11} = w_{00} > w_{10}$	00, 11

TABLE 4. Similar to Tables 1–3, the wild-type 00 has maximal fitness in the drug free environment, 11 for high concentrations, whereas 01 has low fitness in all environment. However, in contrast to the previous tables, there is no longer a trade-off between environments, since 11 has maximal fitness in all environments.

the drug free environment, 11 for high concentrations, whereas 01 has low fitness in all environment. However, in contrast to the previous tables, 11 has maximal fitness in all environments.

Under the given assumption, suppose that a population is exposed to low drug concentrations for an extended period of time ($0 < C < C_T$). Then 00 is a suboptimal peak. By assumption, the population cannot reach the global peak 11 for low concentrations, unless it is first exposed to high concentrations ($C \geq C_T$). In other words, the system has "memory" of sort, since exposure to high drug concentrations causes a permanent change (and increased fitness for any $C > 0$).

Given the variation in behavior already for $L = 2$, it is reasonable to expect interesting dynamics for larger systems, see Das et al. (2022, 2020). Returning to the malaria study, 10 different drug concentrations were considered. Figure 8 summarizes information for all 10 drugs. Each arrow that points up for all 10 concentrations is marked red. The other arrows are black. The graph shows that evolution from 1111 to 0000 is at least theoretically possible under fluctuating drug concentrations.

3. DISCUSSION

Persistent drug resistance is a multifaceted problem. Even if resistance is costly, a drug pause does not necessarily restore susceptibility. A complete analysis requires consideration of both evolutionary processes, including reverse mutations and accumulations of new compensatory mutations, and of non-evolutionary mechanisms such as the potential for regrowth of the former wild-type and properties of replacement drugs. One of the fundamental questions is if evolution is reversible in principle (regardless if reversions are plausible or not). The question of genetic reversibility is immediately related to obstacles in fitness landscapes.

For analyzing local and global obstacles we introduced some new concepts based on rank orders. A rank order preserving block is a subset of loci (sometimes referred to as a module) with the property that the rank order of genotypes that agree at all loci outside of the block does not depend on background. A weaker condition is a graph preserving block, where the rank order of mutational neighbors that agree at all loci outside of the block does not depend on background. The condition implies that the fitness graphs are similar regardless of background (Figure 5). The existence of a rank order preserving




FIGURE 8. The graph summarizes information for ten different concentrations of the drugs, including the drug-free environment. The red arrows indicate fitness differences that are consistent for all ten concentrations of the drug. In particular, 1110 has higher fitness than the double mutants 1100, 1010, 0110, regardless of concentration. Each black arrows indicates that fitness increases for at least one concentration of the drug. The graph shows that fluctuating concentrations could restore the wild-type 0000.

block with suboptimal peaks implies that there are also suboptimal peaks in the global fitness landscape, and likewise for graph preserving blocks. For a study of irreversible malarial drug resistance (Ogbunugafor and Hartl, 2016), we identified a double peaked graph preserving block (modulo a single deviating genotype).

If the L -sequence (the genom) can be partitioned into rank order preserving blocks, the result can be considered a generalization of block landscapes (Perelson and Macken, 1995). All else equal, adding more blocks does not make the fitness landscape more favorable.

In general, rank order induced (or signed) interactions (Crona, 2020; Crona et al., 2020, 2017) including signed versions of higher order epistasis and circuits (introduced to biology in Beerenkel et al. (2007)), have been used for analyzing accessibility and obstacles in fitness landscapes, as well as for detecting interactions from incomplete data. Rank order and graph preserving blocks provide similar insights, and obviously all the signed concepts are analogous to sign epistasis (Weinriech et al., 2005) in that they capture order implications and are blind for magnitude differences that do no impact on rank orders.

We considered the relation between fitness landscapes for forward and reverse evolution. For $L = 2$ we conjecture that absence of sign epistasis for forward evolution

correlate with reversible evolution. More generally, one can ask if favorable landscapes for forward evolution correlate with reversibility. Results in Das et al. (2022, 2020) are compatible with such a claim, but more empirical studies would be necessary for a conclusion.

For landscapes defined by different drug concentrations, it is of interest to compare concentration thresholds for forward and reverse evolution. The dynamics for $L = 2$ is already interesting. We demonstrated that successful adaptation to low drug concentration may require a history of adaptation to high drug concentrations. We have argued that thresholds asymmetries are plausible. The impact of fluctuating drug concentrations was analyzed for the study on irreversible malarial drug resistance mentioned. Reversion to the original wild-type was at least theoretically possible, which illustrates that fluctuating concentration within the range of two extremes (here high drug concentration and the drug-free environment) can result in qualitatively different outcomes as compared to switches between the extremes.

We have pointed out that peak and rank order preserving blocks are incompatible with some standard constructions of fitness landscapes that use random fitness (see the discussion about hop-to-top landscapes), and that neither redundancy nor decreased peak density by L imply that fitness landscapes are favorable for large L . It appears that no simple summary statistics can predict whether or not a fitness landscape is favorable. A natural category of rugged landscapes with good peak accessibility is identified in Das et al. (2020), which is another indication that ruggedness alone does not reveal the character of a fitness landscape.

However, evolutionary reversibility is a potential indicator of fundamental properties of fitness landscapes. Whether or not the wild-type can be restored and properties of new genotypes that result from compensatory mutations carry information about peak constellations, accessibility and constraints in the landscape. Sufficiently complete and precise empirical studies of resistance and its reversal could contribute to a better understanding of microbial evolution, in particular of microbial fitness landscapes.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. C., Engelstädter, J., Bonhoeffer, S., McDonald, B. A., and Hall, A. R. (2017). Reversing resistance: different routes and common themes across pathogens. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284(1863), 20171619.
- Beerenwinkel, N., Pachter, L., and Sturmfels, B. (2007). Epistasis and shapes of fitness landscapes. *Statistica Sinica*, 1317-1342.
- Björkman, J., Nagaev, I., Berg, O. G., Hughes, D., and Andersson, D. I. (2000). Effects of environment on compensatory mutations to ameliorate costs of antibiotic resistance. *Science*, 287(5457), 1479-1482.
- Castro, H. et al. (2020) Persistence of HIV-1 transmitted drug resistance mutations. *The Journal of infectious diseases* 208.9 (2013): 1459-1463.
- Crona, K. (2020). Rank orders and signed interactions in evolutionary biology. *Elife*, 9, e51004.

- Crona, K. (2014). Polytopes, graphs and fitness landscapes. In *Recent advances in the theory and application of fitness landscapes* (pp. 177-205). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Crona K., Gavryushkin, A., Greene, D., and Beerenwinkel, N. (2017). Inferring genetic interactions from comparative fitness data. *Elife*, 6, e28629.
- Crona, K., Greene, D. and Barlow, M. (2013). The peaks and geometry of fitness landscapes. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 317, 1-10.
- Crona, K., Krug, J., and Srivastava, M. (2023). Geometry of fitness landscapes: peaks, shapes and universal positive epistasis. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 86(4), 62.
- Crona, K., Luo, M., and Greene, D. (2020). An uncertainty law for microbial evolution. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 489, 110155.
- Das, S. G., Direito, S. O., Waclaw, B., Allen, R. J., and Krug, J. (2020). Predictable properties of fitness landscapes induced by adaptational tradeoffs. *Elife*, 9, e55155.
- Das, S. G., Krug, J., and Mungan, M. (2022). Driven Disordered Systems Approach to Biological Evolution in Changing Environments. *Physical Review X*, 12(3), 031040.
- De Visser, J. A. G., Park, S. C., and Krug, J. (2009). Exploring the effect of sex on empirical fitness landscapes. *the american naturalist*, 174(S1), S15-S30.
- De Vos, M. G., Dawid, A., Sunderlikova, V., and Tans, S. J. (2015). Breaking evolutionary constraint with a tradeoff ratchet. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(48), 14906-14911.
- Dunai, A. et al. (2019). Rapid decline of bacterial drug-resistance in an antibiotic-free environment through phenotypic reversion. *Elife*, 8, e47088.
- Enne, V. I., Livermore, D. M., Stephens, P., and Hall, L. M. (2001). Persistence of sulphonamide resistance in *Escherichia coli* in the UK despite national prescribing restriction. *The lancet*, 357(9265), 1325-1328.
- Gavrilet, S. (1997). Evolution and speciation on holey adaptive landscapes. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 12(8), 307-312.
- Greenbury, S. F., Louis, A. A., and Ahnert, S. E. (2022). The structure of genotype-phenotype maps makes fitness landscapes navigable. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* 6(11), 1742-1752.
- Goulart, C., Mahmudi, M., Crona, K., Jacobs, S., Kallmann, M., Hall, B., Greene, D. and Barlow, M. Designing antibiotic cycling strategies by determining and understanding local adaptive landscapes. *PloS one* 8, no. 2 (2013): e56040.
- Haldane, J. B. S. (1931). A mathematical theory of natural selection. Part VIII. Metastable populations. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* (Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 137-142). Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenbach, M., Jackson, C. J., Campbell, E. C., Hollfelder, F., and Tokuriki, N. (2015). Reverse evolution leads to genotypic incompatibility despite functional and active site convergence. *Elife*, 4, e0649
- Lobanovska, M. and Pilla, G. (2017). Focus: drug development: Penicillin's discovery and antibiotic resistance: lessons for the future?. *The Yale journal of biology and medicine*, 90(1), 135.

- Maisnier-Patin, S., Berg, O. G., Liljas, L., and Andersson, D. I. (2002). Compensatory adaptation to the deleterious effect of antibiotic resistance in *Salmonella typhimurium*. *Molecular microbiology*, 46(2), 355-366.
- Nagaev, I., Björkman, J., Andersson, D. I., and Hughes, D. (2001). Biological cost and compensatory evolution in fusidic acid-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Molecular microbiology*, 40(2), 433-439.
- Mira, P. M., Crona, K., Greene, D., Meza, J. C., Sturmfels, B., and Barlow, M. (2015). Rational design of antibiotic treatment plans: a treatment strategy for managing evolution and reversing resistance. *PLoS one*, 10(5), e0122283.
- Ogbunugafor, C. B. and Hartl, D. (2016) A pivot mutation impedes reverse evolution across an adaptive landscape for drug resistance in *Plasmodium vivax*. *Malaria journal* 15(1), 1–10.
- Pennings, P. S., Ogbunugafor, C. B., and Hershberg, R. (2022). Reversion is most likely under high mutation supply when compensatory mutations do not fully restore fitness costs. *G3*, 12(9), jkac190.
- Perelson, Alan S., and Catherine A. Macken. (1995) "Protein evolution on partially correlated landscapes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 92.21: 9657-9661.
- Poelwijk, F. J., Tănase-Nicola, S., Kiviet, D. J., and Tans, S. J. (2011). Reciprocal sign epistasis is a necessary condition for multi-peaked fitness landscapes. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 272(1), 141-144.
- Poelwijk, F. J., Kiviet, D. J., Weinreich, D. M., and Tans, S. J. (2007). Empirical fitness landscapes reveal accessible evolutionary paths. *Nature*, 445(7126), 383-386.
- Riehl, M., Phillips, R., Pudwell, L., and Chenette, N. (2022). Occurrences of reciprocal sign epistasis in single- and multi-peaked theoretical fitness landscapes. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 55(43), 434002.
- Saona, R., Kondrashov, F. A., and Khudiakova, K. A. (2022). Relation between the number of peaks and the number of reciprocal sign epistatic interactions. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 84(8), 74.
- Schmiegelt, B and Krug, J. (2014). Evolutionary accessibility of modular fitness landscapes. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 154, 334-355.
- Sundqvist, M., Geli, P., Andersson, D. I., Sjölund-Karlsson, M., Runeheggen, A., Cars, H., Abelson-Storby, K., Cars, O. and Kahlmeter, G (2010). Little evidence for reversibility of trimethoprim resistance after a drastic reduction in trimethoprim use. *Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*, 65(2), 350-360.
- Tran, N. M., and Yang, J. (2017). Antibiotics time machines are hard to build. *Notices of the AMS*, 64(10), 1136-1140.
- Weinreich, D. M., Watson, R. A., and Chao, L. (2005). Perspective: sign epistasis and genetic constraint on evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution*, 59(6), 1165-1174.
- Yang, W. L. et al. (2015) Persistence of transmitted HIV-1 drug resistance mutations associated with fitness costs and viral genetic backgrounds. *PLoS pathogens* 11.3 : e1004722.