

Multiallelic Walsh transforms

Devin Greene

*American University, 4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington,
DC, United States, 20016*

Abstract

A closed formula multiallelic Walsh (or Hadamard) transform is introduced. Basic results are derived, and a statistical interpretation of some of the resulting linear forms is discussed.

1 Introduction

The Walsh, or Hadamard matrix, is used in evolutionary biology to detect and quantify epistasis, i.e. interactions, among the effects of alleles over different loci. However, applications using the Walsh transform are restricted to *biallelic* systems: those where each locus has two alleles. Here we develop two versions of the Walsh matrix which described any multilocus, multiallele system.

Various authors have attempted to defined multiallelic analogs of the Walsh transform: See, for instance, [FLMP⁺23], [MPST23]. In [FLMP⁺23], the authors develop a recursive Walsh transform which is closely related to the one we develop here. However, our approach uses closed formulas to describe the two related versions of the transform. Furthermore, we emphasize the linear forms which arise from these matrices, which generalize the notion of Walsh coefficients introduced to evolutionary biology in [WLWH13].

2 Preliminaries

Consider a genotype with n loci, numbered 1 through n . Assume that each locus i has $t_i \geq 1$ possible alleles. We label the alleles of a particular locus $0, 1, 2, \dots, t_i - 1$. If we use the finite integer segment notation, i.e.

$$[a, b) = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b - 1\},$$

where a, b are integers, then the set of alleles at the i th locus is $[0, t_i)$.

We denote a genotype g as follows. Let a_i be the allele at the i th locus of g . Then

$$g = a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n$$

Note that the set of genotypes is naturally equivalent to the Cartesian product

$$[0, t_1) \times \cdots \times [0, t_n)$$

This property will be fundamental for our sum-taking manipulations in this paper. For example, for any locus i , the summation

$$\sum_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n}$$

can be replaced with

$$\sum_{a_1|\cdots|a_{i-1}|a_{i+1}|\cdots|a_n} \sum_{a_i} \quad (2.1)$$

Furthermore, if $f_{j,i}$ are terms in a product, where $f_{j,i}$ depends only on the locus i and allele j , then

$$\sum_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{a_i,i}$$

can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{a_1|\cdots|a_{k-1}|a_{k+1}|\cdots|a_n} \prod_{0 \leq i \neq k \leq n} f_{a_i,i} \sum_{a_k} f_{a_k,k} \quad (2.2)$$

The replacements (2.1) and (2.2) will be used without comment for the remainder of this paper.

We stress that the labelling of alleles should not be interpreted to imply any ranking or ordinality among those in the same locus. We could have labelled them with any set of symbols. However, for the sake of convenience in mathematical notation, we use integers. Nevertheless, in this paper's development, the allele in each locus labeled "0" will play a special role as a "base" or "anchor" point. Though we will not address it in this article, it

can be shown that the choice of an “anchor” allele at each locus does not in any fundamental way treat such alleles as special or distinct from the others.

We define the set of *fitness landscapes* to be the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$ with the standard component-wise inner product, where the components are indexed by the set of genotypes. The standard basis vector for genotype $a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n$ is denoted using square brackets, e.g. as $[a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n]$.

3 Two dual multiallelic Walsh transforms

The Walsh, or Hadamard matrix, is a 2^n by 2^n matrix with rows and columns indexed by bit strings of length n , whose $i_1 \dots i_n, j_1 \dots j_n$ th matrix element can be defined by the formula

$$(-1)^{i_1 j_1 + i_2 j_2 + \dots + i_n j_n}$$

The Walsh matrix has been used to measure interactions among loci in biallelic systems. Here, we introduce two linear transformations which generalize to an arbitrary number of alleles per locus.

Before presenting the definitions, we define two functions: the ω function and the μ function.

The ω function is defined on pairs of elements in a set with a unique zero element as

$$\omega_{x,y} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ and } x = y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The μ function is defined on pairs of elements in a similar type of set.

$$\mu_{x,y} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ or } y = 0, \text{ otherwise} \\ -1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We remark that both of these functions are symmetric with respect to their arguments, i.e. $\omega_{x,y} = \omega_{y,x}$ and $\mu_{x,y} = \mu_{y,x}$.

In the following definition, recall that t_1, \dots, t_n are the number of alleles at loci $1, 2, \dots, n$.

Definition 3.1. We define the linear transformations W and Z in $\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$ with respect to the standard basis as follows.

$$W [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n] = \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, b_i}) [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \quad (3.2)$$

$$Z [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n] = \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{a_i, b_i} [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \quad (3.3)$$

For convenience, we adopt the following superscript notation:

$$\begin{aligned} [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w &= W [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n] \\ [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z &= Z [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n] \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.1. To understand the motivation behind Definition 3.1, consider the vectors $[2|0]^w$ and $[2|0]^z$ in $\mathbb{C}^{3,3}$. From (3.2) and (3.3) above,

$$\begin{aligned} [2|0]^w &= [0|0] + [0|1] + [0|2] + [1|0] - 2 [2|0] \\ &\quad + [1|1] + [1|2] - 2 [2|1] - 2 [2|2] \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$[2|0]^z = [0|0] + [0|1] + [0|2] - [2|0] - [2|1] - [2|2] \quad (3.5)$$

If we take the inner product of a fitness landscape v with each vector above, we obtain the following linear forms.

$$\langle v, [2|0]^w \rangle = v_{00} + v_{01} + v_{02} + v_{10} - 2v_{20} + v_{11} + v_{12} - 2v_{21} - 2v_{22} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\langle v, [2|0]^z \rangle = v_{00} + v_{01} + v_{02} - v_{20} - v_{21} - v_{22} \quad (3.7)$$

We can rewrite (3.6), up to a scalar multiple, as

$$\frac{(v_{20} - \frac{v_{00}+v_{10}}{2}) + (v_{21} - \frac{v_{01}+v_{11}}{2}) + (v_{22} - \frac{v_{02}+v_{12}}{2})}{3}$$

This is readily interpreted as being the average effect of replacing the allele at the first locus with ‘2’ as compared to the average of the alternatives.

Rewriting (3.7), we obtain, up a scalar multiple,

$$\frac{(v_{20} - v_{00}) + (v_{21} - v_{01}) + (v_{22} - v_{02})}{3}$$

which can be interpreted as the average effect of replacing ‘0’ in the first locus with ‘2’.

Example 3.2. The formulas (3.2) and (3.3) give the same vector at $[0|0| \dots |0]$, indeed

$$[0|0| \dots |0]^w = [0|0| \dots |0]^z = \sum_{a_1|a_2| \dots |a_n} [a_1|a_2| \dots |a_n]$$

Thus if v is a fitness landscape in $\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t_1 \dots t_n} \langle v, [0|0| \dots |0]^w \rangle &= \frac{1}{t_1 \dots t_n} \langle v, [0|0| \dots |0]^z \rangle \\ &= \text{the average over all of } v \text{'s components} \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem constitutes the main result of this article.

Theorem 3.1.

1. W and Z are self-adjoint.
2. W and Z are scaled inverses of each other. Explicitly

$$ZW = WZ = t_1 \dots t_n I \tag{3.8}$$

3. W^2 and Z^2 are positive definite and block diagonal with matching block subspaces. Explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} (W^2)_{a_1|a_2| \dots |a_n, b_1|b_2| \dots |b_n} \\ = \prod_{i=1}^n t_i (\delta_{a_i, 0} \delta_{b_i, 0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i, 0})(1 - \delta_{b_i, 0})(t_i \delta_{a_i, b_i} - 1)) \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (Z^2)_{a_1|a_2| \dots |a_n, b_1|b_2| \dots |b_n} \\ = \prod_{i=1}^n (t_i \delta_{a_i, 0} \delta_{b_i, 0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i, 0})(1 - \delta_{b_i, 0})(1 + \delta_{a_i, b_i})) \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. We start with the matrix representations of W and Z with respect to the standard basis. (Strictly speaking, since Definition 3.1 is a vector definition, we should distinguish between left acting matrices and right acting matrices. However, since ω and μ are symmetric on their arguments, the distinction is irrelevant, and all the more so when we have shown that the matrices are self-adjoint.)

$$(W)_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n, b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, b_i})$$

$$(Z)_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n, b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{a_i, b_i}$$

Part 1 then follows immediately from the symmetry of ω and μ as was just alluded to.

We use induction for Part 2. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. Assume validity at n , and consider the matrix element of the product of W and Z at $n + 1$:

$$\sum_{c_1|c_2|\dots|c_{n+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, c_i}) \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \mu_{c_i, b_i} \quad (3.11)$$

We write (3.11) as

$$\sum_{c_1|c_2|\dots|c_n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, c_i}) \mu_{c_i, b_i} \sum_{c_{n+1}} (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}}) \mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}}$$

For the remainder of this part of the proof, the focus will be on the sum

$$\sum_{c_{n+1}} (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}}) \mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} \quad (3.12)$$

Case: $a_{n+1} = b_{n+1} = 0$. In this case $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 0$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 1$ for all c_{n+1} . Thus each summand in (3.12) is 1, and so the total sum is t_{n+1} . The desired result follows by induction.

Case: $a_{n+1} = b_{n+1} \neq 0$. When $c_{n+1} = 0$, $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 0$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 1$, in which case the summand is 1. When $c_{n+1} = a_{n+1} = b_{n+1}$, $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 1$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = -1$, thus the summand is $t_{n+1} - 1$. For other values of c_{n+1} , $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 0$, thus the summand is 0. It follows that the sum (3.12) is t_{n+1} . The result follows by induction.

Case: $a_{n+1} \neq b_{n+1} = 0$. In this case $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 1$ for all c_{n+1} , and so the sum (3.12) can be expressed as $\sum_{c_{n+1}} (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}})$. If $c_{n+1} \neq a_{n+1}$, then $\omega_{c_{n+1}, a_{n+1}} = 0$, in which case the summand is 1. If $c_{n+1} = a_{n+1}$, then $\omega_{c_{n+1}, a_{n+1}} = 1$, and the summand is $1 - t_{n+1}$. The total sum is then 0, as it should be since $a_1 |a_2| \cdots |a_{n+1}| \neq b_1 |b_2| \cdots |b_{n+1}|$

Case: $b_{n+1} \neq a_{n+1} = 0$. In this case $\omega_{c_{n+1}, a_{n+1}} = 0$ for all c_{n+1} , so (3.12) can be expressed as $\sum_{c_{n+1}=0}^{t_{n+1}-1} \mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} \cdot \mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 1$ when $c_{n+1} = 0$, and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = -1$ when $c_{n+1} = b_{n+1}$. Otherwise, $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 0$. Thus the sum (3.12) is 0, as it should be since $a_1 |a_2| \cdots |a_{n+1}| \neq b_1 |b_2| \cdots |b_{n+1}|$

Case: $a_{n+1} \neq b_{n+1}$, and $a_{n+1}, b_{n+1} \neq 0$. In this case when $c_{n+1} = 0$, $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 0$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 1$ thus the summand is 1. When $c_{n+1} = a_{n+1}$ then $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 1$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = 0$, thus the summand is 0. When $c_{n+1} = b_{n+1}$ then $\omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}} = 0$ and $\mu_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}} = -1$ thus the summand is -1 . Thus the sum (3.12) totals to 0, as it should since $a_1 |a_2| \cdots |a_{n+1}| \neq b_1 |b_2| \cdots |b_{n+1}|$

This completes the proof for Part 2.

For Part 3, W^2 is positive definite since W is invertible, and $WW^* = W^2$. Similarly for Z^2 . The claim respecting block diagonality follows from the formulas (3.9) and (3.10), which we now prove by induction on n . For both Z and W , the case where $n = 0$ is trivial. Assume validity at n , and consider a matrix element of W at $n + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (W^2)_{a_1 |a_2| \cdots |a_{n+1}, b_1 |b_2| \cdots |b_{n+1}} \\
&= \sum_{c_1 |c_2| \cdots |c_{n+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, c_i}) (1 - t_i \omega_{c_i, b_i}) \\
&= \sum_{c_1 |c_2| \cdots |c_n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - t_i \omega_{a_i, c_i}) (1 - t_i \omega_{c_i, b_i}) \\
&\times \sum_{c_{n+1}} (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}}) (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{c_{n+1}, a_{n+1}}) \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

We focus on the term

$$\sum_{c_{n+1}} (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{a_{n+1}, c_{n+1}}) (1 - t_{n+1} \omega_{c_{n+1}, b_{n+1}}) \tag{3.14}$$

By induction, in each case that follows, it suffices to show that (3.14) is equivalent to the expression

$$t_{n+1}(\delta_{a_i,0}\delta_{b_i,0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i,0})(1 - \delta_{b_i,0})(t_{n+1}\delta_{a_i,b_i} - 1)) \quad (3.15)$$

Case: $a_i = b_i = 0$. In this case (3.14) is t_{n+1} , as is (3.15).

Case: $a_i = b_i \neq 0$. In this case (3.14) is

$$(1 - t_{n+1})^2 + t_{n+1} - 1 = (t_{n+1} - 1)t_{n+1}$$

as is (3.15)

Case: $a_i \neq b_i = 0$ or $b_i \neq a_i = 0$. In this case (3.14) is

$$(1 - t_{n+1}) + (t_{n+1} - 1) = 0$$

as is (3.15)

Case: $a_i \neq b_i, a_i, b_i \neq 0$. In this case (3.14) is

$$2(1 - t_{n+1}) + (t_{n+1} - 2) = -t_{n+1}$$

as is (3.15)

Now consider the matrix element of Z at $n + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & (Z^2)_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_{n+1},b_1|b_2|\dots|b_{n+1}} \\ &= \sum_{c_1|c_2|\dots|c_{n+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \mu_{a_i,c_i} \mu_{c_i,b_i} \\ &= \sum_{c_1|c_2|\dots|c_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{a_i,c_i} \mu_{c_i,b_i} \\ & \quad \times \sum_{c_{n+1}} \mu_{a_{n+1},c_{n+1}} \mu_{c_{n+1},a_{n+1}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Similarly to how we handled W , we focus on the term

$$\sum_{c_{n+1}} \mu_{a_{n+1},c_{n+1}} \mu_{c_{n+1},a_{n+1}} \quad (3.17)$$

and show by induction that each case has (3.17) equal to

$$t_i \delta_{a_i,0} \delta_{b_i,0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i,0})(1 - \delta_{b_i,0})(1 + \delta_{a_i,b_i}) \quad (3.18)$$

Case: $a_i = b_i = 0$. In this case (3.17) is t_{n+1} , as is (3.18).

Case: $a_i = b_i \neq 0$. In this case (3.17) is 2, as is (3.18).

Case: $a_i \neq b_i = 0$ or $b_i \neq a_i = 0$. In this case (3.17) is 0, as is (3.18).

Case: $a_i \neq b_i, a_i, b_i \neq 0$. In this case (3.17) is 1, as is (3.18).

□

For the remainder of this paper, we will identify W and Z with their matrix representations on the standard basis.

Corollary 3.1. *The sets*

$$\{ [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w \}_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n}$$

and

$$\{ [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z \}_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n}$$

are bases for $\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$. Furthermore, if v is a fitness landscape, and the coefficients in the first basis are $c_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n}$, i.e.

$$v = \sum_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} c_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w,$$

then

$$c_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} = \frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_n} \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} Z_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n, b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} v_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n}$$

If $s_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n}$ are the coefficients in the second basis, i.e.

$$v = \sum_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} s_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z$$

then

$$s_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n} = \frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_n} \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} W_{a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n, b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} v_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n}$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.1 and basis changing methods in linear algebra. □

Definition 3.2. The degree of a genotype $a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n$ is the number of non-zero alleles, i.e.

$$\deg(a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n) = \#\{i|a_i \neq 0\}$$

Corollary 3.2. Let $a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n$ and $b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n$ be two genotypes with different degrees. Then

$$\langle [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w, [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n]^w \rangle = 0$$

and

$$\langle [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z, [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n]^z \rangle = 0$$

Proof. If $a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n$ and $b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n$ have different degree, then there must a locus i such that one of a_i, b_i is zero the the other non-zero. Then, by (3.9) and (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w, [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n]^w \rangle \\ &= \langle W^2 [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n], [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \rangle \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n t_i (\delta_{a_i,0}\delta_{b_i,0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i,0})(1 - \delta_{b_i,0})(t_i\delta_{a_i,b_i} - 1)) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z, [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n]^z \rangle \\ &= \langle Z^2 [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n], [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \rangle \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (t_i\delta_{a_i,0}\delta_{b_i,0} + (1 - \delta_{a_i,0})(1 - \delta_{b_i,0})(1 + \delta_{a_i,b_i})) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.3. Define the following subspaces:

$$S_{i,z} = \text{span}(\{ [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z | \deg(a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n) = i \})$$

and

$$S_{i,m} = \text{span}(\{ [a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w | \deg(a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n) = i \})$$

Then

1. $S_{i,z} = S_{i,m}$ for each i , and we will denote the common subspace S_i ,
and

2. $\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n} = S_0 \oplus S_1 \oplus \dots \oplus S_n$ is an orthogonal decomposition.

Proof. That

$$\mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n S_{i,z} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n S_{i,m}$$

follows immediately from Corollary 3.2.

Let $a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n$ and $b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n$ be two genotypes of different degree. Taking inner products, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle Z [a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n], W [b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n] \rangle \\ &= \langle WZ [a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n], [b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n] \rangle \\ &= t_1 \dots t_n \langle [a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n], [b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n] \rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $S_{i,m} = S_{i,z}$ for each i , completing the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. In the presentation of the bases derived from W and Z (i.e. the columns of their matrices when written in the standard basis), we have avoided any discussion of the appropriate scaling of these vectors or that of the coefficients corresponding to them, preferring to express these vectors in integral form. The magnitude of any vector in the W - or Z -basis can be computed directly or by using one of the formulas (3.9) or (3.10).

It is worth keeping in mind that unlike the biallelic Walsh matrix, the columns of W (or the columns of Z) are not all mutually orthogonal.

4 Additive fitness landscapes

Definition 4.1. A fitness landscape $v \in \mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$ is said to be additive if for every allele a_i at locus i there exists an additive effect $\phi_v(a_i, i)$ such that for all genotypes $a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n$,

$$v_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_v(a_i, i)$$

Theorem 4.1. Using the notation from Corollary 3.3, we have the following equivalence:

$$\text{The set of additive fitness landscapes} = S_0 \oplus S_1 \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. \subseteq : We use the term *unit element for allele c_k at locus k* to denote the additive fitness landscape u with the property

$$\phi_u(b_j, j) = \delta_{(c_k, k), (b_j, j)}$$

for any allele b_j and locus j . It should be clear from Definition 4.1 that

$$\text{span}(\text{unit elements}) = \text{set of additive fitness landscapes}$$

Let $u \in \mathbb{C}^{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n}$ be the unit element corresponding to the allele-locus pair (c_k, k) , and let $a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n$ be a genotype with degree ≥ 2 . Then there must be a locus $m \neq k$ where $a_m \neq 0$.

We compute the coefficient of u at $[b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n]^{\mathbf{w}}$ using Corollary 3.1 and ignoring the factor $1/t_i \dots t_n$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n} Z_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n, b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n} u_{b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n} \\ &= \sum_{b_1|b_2|\dots|b_n, b_k=c_k} \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{a_i, b_i} \\ &= \sum_{b_1|\dots|b_{m-1}|b_{m+1}|\dots|b_n, b_k=c_k} \prod_{i \neq m} \mu_{a_i, b_i} \sum_{b_m} \mu_{a_m, b_m} \quad (\text{Since } m \neq k) \\ &= 0 \quad (\text{Since } a_m \neq 0) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the coefficients of u in the basis $\{[a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n]^{\mathbf{w}}\}_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n}$ are non-zero only for basis elements with degree ≤ 1 , proving the inclusion.

\supseteq : From Corollary 3.3, S_0 is spanned by $[0|\dots|0]^{\mathbf{z}}$, and from (3.3),

$$[0|\dots|0]^{\mathbf{z}} = \sum_{a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n} [a_1|a_2|\dots|a_n].$$

This is clearly the additive fitness landscape with effect $1/n$ for all alleles.

From Corollary 3.3, S_1 is spanned by vectors which have the form

$[0|\cdots|a_j|\cdots|0]^z$, where $a_j \neq 0$. From (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& [0|\cdots|a_j|\cdots|0]^z \\
&= \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} \mu_{a_j,b_j} \mu_{0,b_j}^{n-1} [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \\
&= \sum_{b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n} \mu_{a_j,b_j} [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \quad (\text{Since } \mu_{0,b_j} = 1) \\
&= \sum_{b_1|\cdots|b_{j-1}|0|b_{j+1}|\cdots|b_n} [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n] \\
&\quad - \sum_{b_1|\cdots|b_{j-1}|a_j|b_{j+1}|\cdots|b_n} [b_1|b_2|\cdots|b_n]
\end{aligned}$$

This is an additive fitness landscape with effect $1/n$ for all alleles at loci $\neq j$, effect $1/n$ for the 0 allele at locus j , effect $(1 - 2n)/n$ for allele a_j at loci j , and $(1 - n)/n$ at all other alleles at locus j .

This completes the proof. \square

5 Further examples

In this final section, we continue in the spirit of Examples 3.1 and 3.2 and interpret basis vectors in the form $[a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^w$ or $[a_1|a_2|\cdots|a_n]^z$ as linear forms and give an interpretation in the language of interacting effects.

Consider the case with two loci where each has three alleles. The following are the corresponding matrices for W and Z .

$$W = \begin{matrix} & 0|0 & 0|1 & 0|2 & 1|0 & 2|0 & 1|1 & 1|2 & 2|1 & 2|2 \\ \begin{matrix} 0|0 \\ 0|1 \\ 0|2 \\ 1|0 \\ 2|0 \\ 1|1 \\ 1|2 \\ 2|1 \\ 2|2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & -2 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & 1 & -2 & -2 & -2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & -2 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 4 & -2 & -2 & -2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -2 & -2 & 1 & -2 & 4 & 1 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 & -2 & -2 & 1 & 4 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & 1 & -2 & 1 & -2 & 1 & -2 & -2 & -2 & 4 \end{pmatrix} & (5.1) \end{matrix}$$

$$Z = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 0|0 & 0|1 & 0|2 & 1|0 & 2|0 & 1|1 & 1|2 & 2|1 & 2|2 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 0|0 \\ 0|1 \\ 0|2 \\ 1|0 \\ 2|0 \\ 1|1 \\ 1|2 \\ 2|1 \\ 2|2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \quad (5.2)$$

The block diagonality in Theorem 3.1, including the orthogonal decomposition with respect to degree asserted in Corollary 3.3 is seen when we compute W^2 and Z^2 .

$$W^2 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 0|0 & 0|1 & 0|2 & 1|0 & 2|0 & 1|1 & 1|2 & 2|1 & 2|2 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 0|0 \\ 0|1 \\ 0|2 \\ 1|0 \\ 2|0 \\ 1|1 \\ 1|2 \\ 2|1 \\ 2|2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 18 & -9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -9 & 18 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 18 & -9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -9 & 18 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 36 & -18 & -18 & 9 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -18 & 36 & 9 & -18 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -18 & 9 & 36 & -18 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 9 & -18 & -18 & 36 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

$$Z^2 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 0|0 & 0|1 & 0|2 & 1|0 & 2|0 & 1|1 & 1|2 & 2|1 & 2|2 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 0|0 \\ 0|1 \\ 0|2 \\ 1|0 \\ 2|0 \\ 1|1 \\ 1|2 \\ 2|1 \\ 2|2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 6 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

We saw in Examples 3.1 and 3.2 how some of the basis vectors generated by W and Z gave rise to zeroth and first order linear forms. Having all the vectors in column form in (3.4) and (3.5) allows us to compute, for any fitness landscape v ,

$$\langle v, [1|1]^{\mathbf{w}} \rangle = v_{00} - 2v_{01} + v_{02} - 2v_{10} + v_{20} + 4v_{11} - 2v_{12} - 2v_{21} + v_{22} \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\langle v, [1|1]^{\mathbf{z}} \rangle = v_{00} - v_{01} - v_{10} + v_{11} \quad (5.4)$$

If we compare these forms to the analogous form arising from the biallelic Walsh transform, i.e.

$$u_{00} - u_{01} - u_{10} + u_{11}$$

we see that (5.4) is essentially the same.

The form (5.3) is a little trickier to interpret. We can start with the difference between v_{11} and the average of its alternatives which differ at both loci:

$$v_{11} - \frac{1}{4}(v_{00} + v_{02} + v_{20} + v_{22}) \quad (5.5)$$

The averaged first order effects of replacing an allele with allele 1 in a single locus (cf. Example 3.1) are given by

$$** \rightarrow *1 : \frac{1}{3}(v_{01} + v_{11} + v_{21}) - \frac{1}{6}(v_{00} + v_{02} + v_{10} + v_{20} + v_{12} + v_{22}) \quad (5.6)$$

$$** \rightarrow 1* : \frac{1}{3}(v_{10} + v_{11} + v_{12}) - \frac{1}{6}(v_{00} + v_{01} + v_{02} + v_{20} + v_{21} + v_{22}) \quad (5.7)$$

If we want the ‘‘pure’’ second order effect of substituting ‘11’ for one of ‘00’, ‘02’, ‘20’, or ‘22’, we should subtract (5.6) and (5.7) from (5.5). When we do so, we obtain one twelfth of (5.3), a useful interpretation of that form.

References

- [FLMP⁺23] Andre J Faure, Ben Lehner, Verónica Miró Pina, Claudia Serano Colome, and Donat Weghorn. An extension of the walsh-hadamard transform to calculate and model epistasis in genetic landscapes of arbitrary shape and complexity. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–03, 2023.

- [MPST23] Brian PH Metzger, Yeonwoo Park, Tyler N Starr, and Joseph W Thornton. Epistasis facilitates functional evolution in an ancient transcription factor. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–04, 2023.
- [WLWH13] Daniel M Weinreich, Yinghong Lan, C Scott Wylie, and Robert B. Heckendorn. Should evolutionary geneticists worry about higher-order epistasis? *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development*, 23(6):700–707, 2013. Genetics of system biology.