

Singular effect of linkage on long term genetic gain in the infinitesimal model

Elise Tourrette¹ and Olivier C. Martin^{2,3}

¹Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, CNRS, AgroParisTech, GQE - Le Moulon, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

²Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, CNRS, Univ. Evry, Institute of Plant Sciences Paris-Saclay (IPS2), 91405 Orsay, France

³Université Paris-Cité, CNRS, INRAE, Institute of Plant Sciences Paris-Saclay (IPS2), 91405 Orsay, France

January 9, 2024

Abstract

During the founding of the field of quantitative genetics, Fisher formulated in 1918 his “infinitesimal model” that provided a novel mathematical framework to describe the Mendelian transmission of quantitative traits. If the infinitely-many genes in that model are assumed to segregate independently during reproduction, corresponding to having no linkage, directional selection asymptotically leads to a constant genetic gain at each generation. However, in reality genes are subject to linkage because they lie on chromosomes and thus segregate in a correlated way. Various approximations have been used in the past to study that more realistic case of the infinitesimal model and they lead to the prediction that the asymptotic gain per generation is modestly decreased. Here we provide an exact solution to the problem where genes lie on continuous chromosomes. Surprisingly, the consequences of genetic linkage are in fact rather singular, changing the *nature* of the long term gain per generation: the asymptotic gain vanishes rather than being simply decreased. Nevertheless, the rate at which the per-generation gain tends to zero is slow enough for the total gain, accumulated over generations, to be unbounded.

keywords: recurrent selection — genetic value — genetic linkage

abbreviations: LD, linkage disequilibrium — CO, crossover — DS, Directional Selection — IM, infinitesimal model — i.i.d, independent and identically distributed

1 Introduction

During mankind’s transition from nomadic to sedentary lifestyles, numerous plant and animal species were successfully domesticated [1]. In some cases this was likely done without intent (e.g., the domestication from wolves to dogs) while in others it probably involved intentional selection of the best individuals (e.g., the domestication from teosinte to maize by native Americans). With the advent of modern times, active directional selection programs were developed on chosen species, allowing dramatic improvements in the genetic value of numerous stocks and crops, many of which are now widely disseminated across the planet [2]. Most of the corresponding traits important for our use – for instance grain yield or amount of biomass – are “quantitative” rather than discrete and have low heritability. For some time, such behavior, empirically described by biometric approaches spearheaded by Galton’s work [3], seemed to contradict Mendelian genetics, but the paradox was elegantly resolved by Fisher who is thus considered as the founder of the fields of mathematical and quantitative genetics. In a series of works beginning in 1918 [4] and summarized in his book [5], he was able to show that when *many* genes contribute to a trait, the Mendelian inheritance of the genes leads to the patterns of trait values from one generation to the next as seen experimentally.

Fisher formalized this many-genes assumption in a now standard quantitative genetics model whereby M genes influence the considered trait, and the alleles – the variants associated with a gene – contribute additively to the trait. His “infinitesimal model” [4] is formally obtained by taking the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$. This limit of an infinite number of genes is particularly attractive because it allows a thorough mathematical treatment, thanks largely to the fact that any selection on individuals of an infinite population affects only infinitesimally the allelic frequencies. The case of *directional selection* is particularly interesting. In such a program to improve a population for a particular trait, one first exploits the variance of the value of that trait in the population, selecting those individuals having the highest values of the trait. This selection of course increases the mean of the trait’s value in the population but it also reduces its underlying causal variance, hereafter referred to simply as the *genetic variance*. After selection of individuals, the second step of directional selection consists in mating these “best” individuals to produce offspring for the next generation. This sexual reproduction is such that offspring inherit half of their alleles from one parent and the other half from their other parent. The two steps – selection followed by reproduction – form a cycle that is at the heart of recurrent selection breeding programs. Within each cycle, the genetic variance is first decreased because of the selection and it is then increased via the genetic shuffling induced by sex.

The numerous studies of this system show that if the population size is infinite and if the inheritance of alleles from parents is completely random, arising independently for the different genes, corresponding to absence of linkage, then the cycling through generations rapidly converges to a *steady-state* regime where each generation is improved by a fixed amount over the previous one. Specifi-

cally, the mean value of the quantitative trait in the population increases by an amount that is asymptotically fixed and strictly positive [6, 7]. This behavior is quite appealing because it justifies both the maintenance of the genetic variance seen in populations and the regular genetic progress obtained in modern selection program. That contrasts strongly with the biometricians' paradigm in which quantitative differences should be diluted away with generations, leading to a genetic variance in a population that would become vanishingly small with increasing generation numbers.

It is not difficult to see that if one relaxes either of the two standard hypotheses of the infinitesimal model (the number of genes M and the population size N both being infinite) then the asymptotic behavior will change quite qualitatively since the genetic gain at each generation will tend towards 0. Thus, using the infinitesimal model to justify the large genetic variance seen in practice in natural populations requires hypothesizing (i) that the population size is sufficiently large and (ii) that the considered trait depends on sufficiently many genes. These conditions of "sufficiently large" and "sufficiently many" are relative to the number of generations over which the infinitesimal model acts: the more generations of directional selection, the more stringently one must meet those two conditions. It is important to note that the infinitesimal model does not include the appearance of mutations, another mechanism that can maintain genetic variance.

The infinitesimal model is almost always studied without any genetic linkage because the mathematical analyses are then much simplified. However, from a biological point of view, genes are in fact subject to tight linkage for the simple reason that they lie along chromosomes. The different works tackling the case *with* linkage have had to introduce various approximations [8, 9, 10]. In all cases, those studies implicitly hypothesize that whether there is genetic linkage or not, the qualitative behavior of the infinitesimal model will be the same: asymptotically there should be a steady state behavior in which the genetic variance is a strictly positive constant, leading to fixed genetic gain per generation. In effect, according to all these previous studies, linkage simply modifies the steady-state variance and thus the genetic gain per generation.

Our focus in the present work concerns whether that standard hypothesis is correct. Interestingly, in spite of the fact that Fisher's infinitesimal model was formulated over a century ago, there has been no mathematical progress in treating the case with linkage to any degree of reliability. Our contribution here is to provide an *exact* solution in the presence of linkage, thereby showing that genetic linkage has quite striking consequences. Indeed, we find that in contrast to expectations, the genetic variance decreases to 0 as the number of generations increases. There is thus no analog of the steady-state behavior arising in the absence of genetic linkage. Instead, a more singular behavior arises whereby the genetic variance goes to zero following a subtle scaling law characteristic of systems undergoing very slow or "aging" dynamics [11, 12].

2 The infinitesimal model without linkage

2.1 Hypotheses

Fisher’s infinitesimal model considers a quantitative trait controlled by a large number M of genes. Each individual (plant or animal) has a genotype embodied by the allelic content of those genes. The cycle of sexual reproduction alternates between the diploid and haploid phase. In the haploid phase, each individual (*i.e.*, gamete) has a single copy of each chromosome so its genotype is specified by a list, with one allele for each gene. In its simplest version which neglects environmental noise, the infinitesimal model takes the value of the individual to be same as the *genetic value*, sometimes called the breeding value, *i.e.*, the sum of the values contributed by each allele:

$$G = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_m \tag{1}$$

where x_m is the (additive) effect of the allele carried by gene m ($0 \leq m \leq M - 1$) in the considered haploid individual. G is partly heritable from parents to offspring because an offspring receives half of its alleles from each parent following a process involving crossovers (*cf.* Fig.1).

Across generations, the allelic content in the population changes because of selection, but the values of the alleles themselves are invariant. Those values are specified in the individuals of the first generation. Typically they are drawn independently from a Gaussian distribution of zero mean and variance proportional to $1/M$. Hereafter, we rescale the units for measuring G , so the variances are exactly $1/M$. Thus, at the first generation, G is a Gaussian random variable of zero mean and unit variance. Over successive generations, the mean of G rises because of the selection imposed on the individuals. Indeed, each generation is produced from the previous one according to the cycle: (i) one selects the individuals (in our framework, the haploid genotypes) having high G values in the current population and (ii) the offspring forming the next generation are obtained from panmictic mating, *i.e.*, by choosing their parents completely at random among those selected individuals and “combining” them via meiotic crossovers. The hypothesis of *no genetic linkage* corresponds to having independent assortment of the alleles when going from parents to offspring. The infinitesimal model is formally obtained by taking the limit whereby both the number of genes M and the population size N go to ∞ .

2.2 The steady-state property

In most breeding programs the selection phase typically keeps all individuals whose trait value is greater than a generation-dependent threshold. If μ and σ are the mean and standard deviation of the trait G within the current population, the threshold value is generally taken as $\mu + \beta\sigma$ where β is a measure of the selection intensity. At large β only a small fraction of the population is used

for mating, and in practice the distribution of G falls off rapidly so that most individuals selected have their trait value very close to the imposed threshold. A major mathematical simplification arises if one selects instead the individuals whose trait value is *exactly* at that threshold (this is possible because the population size is infinite) and if this is done at the haploid stage. With those choices, let us now review the process of going from the initial population to the next generation, for fixed M but then taking M to infinity.

In the initial population (generation 0), all x_m are *i.i.d.* Gaussian random variables of mean 0 and variance $1/M$, so the joint distribution of the x_m is multi-Gaussian and the associated covariance matrix is diagonal. After selection, since we impose $G = \mu_0 + \beta\sigma_0$ ($\mu_0 = 0$ and $\sigma_0 = 1$ in the initial generation), the joint distribution of the x_m is modified but remains multi-Gaussian. Specifically, all the means are now increased by $\beta\sigma_0/M$ and all the variances are multiplied by a factor $1 - 1/M$. However, because the selection introduces a dependency amongst the x_m (their sum is fixed), the (off-diagonal) covariances no longer vanish and instead are all equal to $-1/M^2$.

Moving on to the sexual reproduction phase of the cycle, one takes pairs of individuals and performs random assortment, *i.e.*, the first parent transmits its alleles for $M/2$ randomly chosen genes while the second one transmits its alleles for the other $M/2$ genes. When going from all x_m to a subset thereof, the joint distribution of the x_m in this subset remains multi-Gaussian. Furthermore, the constraint on the sum of the x_m is “lost” within each subset. In fact, as can be seen by direct calculation, the sum of the kept x_m in each case is a Gaussian variable of variance $1/4$. Since the two parents are independently drawn from the infinite population, the G value for the offspring also has a Gaussian distribution, but of variance $1/2$. This boosting of the variance of G by assortment is referred to as the *release* of the variance in G .

Considering now the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of the x_m in the offspring population goes to a multi-Gaussian where the x_m can be considered as independent variables of mean $\beta\sigma_0/M$ and variance $1/M$ but subject to the constraint that G is of variance $1/2$ [13, 14, 6]. Interestingly, with our choice of selection, we reach the steady state of the cycling in just one generation. Specifically, at generation $k \geq 1$, the joint distribution of the x_m is a multi-Gaussian such that the x_m can be considered to be independent Gaussian random variables of variance $1/M$, but subject to the constraint (hidden in covariances that are of order $1/M^2$ and are thus naively “lost” when $M \rightarrow \infty$) that the variance of their sum (*i.e.*, the variance of G) is $1/2$. At each generation, the selection phase of the cycle makes the variance of G go to 0 but then the phase with random assortment restores a variance of $1/2$. One thus has a steady state behavior when comparing one cycle to the next, all statistical properties are constant except for the means: those of the x_m increase by $\beta/M\sqrt{2}$, and that of G increases by $\beta/\sqrt{2}$.

3 The infinitesimal model *with* linkage

3.1 General framework and model choices

Genetic linkage in real biological situations arises because genes belong to chromosomes so the transmission of an allele at one position of a chromosome generally leads to the simultaneous transmission of a large surrounding region, producing strong correlations of inheritance along chromosomes. To facilitate our mathematical analysis of genetic linkage, we shall consider that all genes lie on one circular chromosome. To go from one generation to the next, the chromosome of an offspring will be taken to be a combination of its two parental chromosomes. As illustrated in Fig.1, we implement this combination by introducing two crossovers, say at positions P_1 and P_2 . The “recombined” offspring chromosome will have its $[P_1, P_2]$ region coming from its first parent and its $[P_2, P_1]$ region coming from its other parent. We impose the two regions to be of the same size and take P_1 to be uniformly distributed along the chromosome.




Figure 1: Assortment of alleles with linkage: in our framework, each haploid individual consists of one continuous circular chromosome, one half of which is inherited from its first parent (in blue) while the other half is inherited from its other parent (in red). Crossover points are labeled P_1 and P_2 . Genes positions are labeled by θ ($-\pi \leq \theta < \pi$), while ψ ($-\pi \leq \psi < \pi$) labels the position of the crossover P_1 .

3.2 Exact inter-generation recursion relations

We continue to assume that the population size is infinite. The position of a gene along the circular chromosomes is labeled by its angle θ ($-\pi \leq \theta < \pi$) on

the circle. One can specify the genotype of an individual either by its list of allelic values along the circle or by the corresponding representation in Fourier space. In the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$, this representation takes one from the profile $x(\theta)$ to the Fourier components labeled by k :

$$X_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{-ik\theta} x(\theta) d\theta \quad (2)$$

where k runs over all integers, from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. Since X_{-k} is the complex conjugate of X_k , which we denote $\overline{X_k}$, any genotype can be specified by $\mathbf{X} = \{X_k, 0 \leq k < +\infty\}$. Note that $X_{k=0}$ is real. If one applies the inverse transform, one recovers the profile (which is periodic in θ):

$$x(\theta) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{ik\theta} X_k \quad (3)$$

Consider first the initial population where the $x(\theta)$ are i.i.d. random variables of zero mean, corresponding to Gaussian white noise so that $E[x(\theta)x(\theta')]$ is the Dirac delta function $\delta(\theta - \theta')$. Transforming to Fourier space, we see that the real and imaginary components of \mathbf{X} are independent, all means are 0 and all variances are 1/2 except that of $X_{k=0}$ which is 1. The vector \mathbf{X} specifying a genotype in this initial population thus follows a multi-dimensional complex normal (Gaussian) distribution [15, 16, 17]. All means vanish and the covariance matrix is the diagonal identity matrix:

$$E[(\overline{X_k} - E[\overline{X_k}])(X_{k'} - E[X_{k'}])] = \delta_{k,k'} \quad (4)$$

where $\delta_{k,k'}$ is the Kronecker delta ($k \geq 0$ and $k' \geq 0$). The ‘‘pseudo-covariance’’ matrix (like Eq.4 but without the complex conjugate) is zero everywhere except for the (0,0) entry which is 1.

Strikingly, upon performing selection and the generation of offspring from parents, the distribution of \mathbf{X} will stay multi-dimensional complex. To show that, consider how the X_k are changed as one performs one cycle of directional selection, applying first the selection of parents as was done in the case without linkage and then recombining parents as shown in Fig.1 to produce offspring. It should be clear that the selection of individuals having a given genetic value G simply corresponds to collapsing the distribution of $X_{k=0}$ to a Dirac delta function at that value, leaving all other aspects of the distribution unchanged. With this operation, the distribution of the genotypes remains multi-dimensional complex normal, and in fact the covariance and pseudo-covariance matrices are unchanged except for the (0,0) entry which now vanishes: selection has reduced the variance of G to 0 in our way of implementing the selection.

In the second part of the cycle, there is panmictic mating of the selected individuals. For a given pair of parents of genetic content \mathbf{X} (the transform of $x(\theta)$) and \mathbf{X}' (the transform of $x'(\theta)$), define ψ to be the angle ($-\pi \leq \psi < \pi$) of the point P_1 in Fig.1. The allelic profile of the offspring is the sum of two contributions, $x(\theta)H(\theta - \psi)$ and $x'(\theta)H(\theta - \psi - \pi)$, where H is the periodic

Heaviside function that has the value 1 in all intervals $[2n\pi, (2n+1)\pi]$ and vanishes everywhere else (n can be any integer). The key point is that these terms are linear functions of \mathbf{X} or \mathbf{X}' . (In Appendix I we provide the explicit expressions for the offspring's Fourier coefficients as a function of the parental ones.) Noting that linear combinations of multi-dimensional complex normal variables are themselves multi-dimensional complex normal, we can conclude that at each generation the genotypes in the (infinite) population follow a multi-dimensional complex normal distribution. Consequently, the joint distribution of the X_k is multi-Gaussian at all generations.

Although it may seem challenging to compute the covariance and pseudo-covariance matrices from one cycle to the next, a very useful feature follows from the invariance of the problem under rotation, *i.e.*, $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \delta$ for any shift δ . Indeed, the initial population is invariant under rotations and this invariance is preserved from one generation to the next. That constrains enormously the mathematical equations because when performing a rotation by an angle δ of the profiles of all individuals in the population, each X_k will be multiplied by a phase $e^{-ik\delta}$ showing that the mean of X_k vanishes if $k \neq 0$. Similarly, the covariance of X_k and $X_{k'}$ will be multiplied by $e^{-i(k'-k)\delta}$, showing that the covariance matrix must be diagonal. Applying the same reasoning to the pseudo-covariance matrix, we see that it has to vanish except for its (0,0) entry. Thus, to follow the multidimensional distribution of \mathbf{X} when going from one generation to the next, we only need to determine how the mean of $X_{k=0}$ changes and how the (complex) variances of the X_k are modified. We do this by direct calculation from the expression for an offspring's Fourier coefficients in terms of its parents (that derivation is given in the Appendix I) followed by the calculation of the associated variances (cf. Appendix II). We summarize the results as follows.

Denote by μ_g the mean of X_0 at generation g . Similarly, denote by $\sigma_{k,g}^2$ the (complex) variance of the k -th Fourier coefficient at generation g , that is the expectation of $\overline{X_k}X_k$ (which is real). One then has:

$$\mu_{g+1} = \mu_g + \beta\sigma_{0,g} \quad (5)$$

in direct analogy with what occurs in the absence of linkage, β still being the parameter associated with the selection intensity. Note that the selection for a given value of G affects only the Fourier component at $k = 0$, setting it to zero. Then, including the effects of the second phase of the cycle during which parental alleles are shuffled by crossovers as shown in Fig.1, we obtain the following recursions for the variances which are most easily written using both positive and negative indices for the Fourier coefficients ($-\infty < k, k' < \infty$):

$$\sigma_{k,g+1}^2 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k,g}^2}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi^2} \sum_{k' \text{ odd}} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k+k',g}^2}{k'^2} \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{k,g} = \sigma_{k,g}$ if $k \neq 0$ while $\hat{\sigma}_{0,g} = 0$ because the variance of G is set to 0 during the selection phase. In Eq.6 the sum over k' is to be taken over both positive and negative odd integers (note however that $\sigma_{k,g} = \sigma_{-k,g}$). The initial

conditions for these recursions are $\sigma_{k,g=0}^2 = 1$ for all k , corresponding to the random i.i.d. distribution of the genetic contributions along the chromosome. As a consequence, at all g , one also has the boundary condition for all g : $\sigma_{k,g}^2 \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Eqs.5 and 6 then provide a complete specification of the change in distribution of \mathbf{X} values in the population when going from one generation to the next, in the limit of an infinite number of genes and an infinite population size. In the standard lore, one expects $\sigma_{0,g}^2$ (usually referred to as the additive genetic variance) to go to a limiting strictly positive value at large g .

3.3 Absence of a steady-state solution

The recursions for the variances in Eq.6 have the following interpretation if one thinks of $\sigma_{k,g}^2$ as specifying the amount of “matter” at site k and generation g . When going from g to $g + 1$, half of the matter at each site stays put while the other half is shared across other sites. That sharing is done via a “diffusion”, implemented mathematically via a convolution kernel. In effect, a fraction $4/(\pi^2 k'^2)$ of that transferred matter is assigned to a site at a distance $|k'|$, where k' (positive or negative) is imposed to be odd. (Of course the sum of all those fractions is 1.) Note that this diffusion process conserves the total amount of matter. However the case $k = 0$ includes a resetting whereby all matter at that site is first removed, thereby leading to loss of matter. Therefore, the amount of matter lost at each iteration – at the level of the whole system – is precisely the value of $\sigma_{k=0,g}^2$. Each iteration is thus an alternation of (i) removing all the matter at site $k = 0$ and (ii) diffusing matter across all sites with the aforementioned convolution kernel. In analogy with the case without linkage, we may expect that there is a steady-state solution to these recursions to which the system converges as $g \rightarrow \infty$.

Before treating the true convolution kernel arising here (it is spread out to infinity, thereby complicating the analysis), consider first the simpler situation where one replaces it by the standard diffusion convolution kernel. In that case, the transferred matter is equally shared between one’s nearest neighbors on each side (so k' takes on only the values ± 1). Assume that there exists a steady-state for this system, *i.e.*, that there is a set of $\sigma_{k,*}^2$ which are invariant under the processes of (i) removal of all matter at $k = 0$ and (ii) sharing half of one’s matter between one’s nearest neighbors. The steady state condition then imposes that the matter transferred “out” is exactly compensated by an equal amount of matter transferred “in”. For any $k \neq 0$, that requires $\sigma_{k,*}^2$ to be equal to the average of $\sigma_{k-1,*}^2$ and $\sigma_{k+1,*}^2$. As a consequence, on each side of the origin ($k = 0$), $\sigma_{k,*}^2$ must be linear in k . However, that property necessarily contradicts the boundary condition $\sigma_{k,*}^2 \rightarrow 1$ as $g \rightarrow \infty$, from which we conclude that the initial hypothesis (existence of a steady state) must be false. Instead, the system will exhibit non stationary dynamics, whereby at any finite g the $\sigma_{k,g}^2$ will smoothly interpolate on each side of the site $k = 0$ between a near vanishing value and the value 1 far away, and as g increases, the overall region of very low values will become wider and wider.

The impossibility of a steady-state behavior can also be shown in the continuum scaling limit using a Green function approach. To do so it is convenient to change variables from $\sigma_{k,g}^2$ to $c_{k,g} = 1 - \sigma_{k,g}^2$ and again interpret the variables as amounts of matter. The corresponding boundary conditions are now $c_{k,g} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \pm\infty$ for all g . Furthermore, the step (i) becomes (i') "set $c_{k=0,g}$ to 1" while the step (ii) remains unchanged. The advantage of this change of variables is that the total matter present in the system is finite and so can be more easily followed. In particular, it starts at 0 (*cf.* the initial conditions) and it can only increase at each step. A cycle (one generation) then corresponds to first resetting the value of $c_{k=0,g}$ to 1 and then applying the diffusion step whereby for each site half of its matter is transferred to other sites. Suppose we apply (i') and (ii) starting from the initial conditions and then follow the behavior of the $c_{k,g}$ at large g . Given the definition of the $c_{k,g}$, they will always be less or equal to 1. At each step, some amount of matter is introduced at the site $k = 0$ and then diffusion is applied. Each amount of matter added at generation g_1 at the site $k = 0$ will lead to a spread-out distribution at a later generation g_2 , and in the continuum limit when $g_2 - g_1$ is large that distribution corresponds to the Green function which has a Gaussian form: $\sqrt{\pi(g_2 - g_1)} \exp[-k^2/(g_2 - g_1)]$ (the "missing" factor of 2 in the diffusion constant follows from the fact that at each generation only half of the matter at each site participates in the diffusion). Using the linearity of the equations, this Green function approach then shows that the total response is obtained by summing this last expression over all g_1 values. If the system converges to a putative steady state where $c_{k=0,*} < 1$, then the added amount of matter at each step tends towards a fixed and strictly positive amount, from which we obtain that $c_{k,g_2} \sim \sqrt{g_2}$ at large g_2 . That contradicts the fact that $0 \leq c_{k,g_2} \leq 1$. Thus if the system converges to a steady state distribution, it must satisfy $c_{k=0,*} = 1$. But if that is the case, the steady state condition on the distribution implies $c_{k,*} = 1$ for all k , which does not respect the boundary condition $c_{k,*} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \pm\infty$. This Green function approach thus shows, just like the previous approach, that the system cannot converge to a steady state at large g .

This last method of analysis allows us to now treat the original recursions Eq.6 for which the diffusion convolution kernel decays as $1/k^2$. This convolution kernel has the property that its moments (expectation of k^α) are finite if and only if $\alpha < 1$. This exponent α is characteristic of the so-called α -stable distributions[18] to which our convolution kernel will converge to in the continuum limit. Specifically, based on the generalized central limit theorem [19], the iteration of this convolution kernel at large g leads in the continuum limit to the Cauchy distribution $\pi^{-1}(2g/\pi)/((2g/\pi)^2 + x^2)$. This is the direct analog of the Gaussian distribution of the previous paragraph and it provides the Green function of the problem. We thus repeat the previous reasoning using again the linearity of the recursions. If we assume that the iterations converge to a steady state behavior for which $c_{k=0,*} < 1$, by summing over all contributions produced by the added matter at $1 \leq g_1 \leq g_2$ we obtain $c_{k,g_2} \sim \ln(g_2)$ at large g_2 . This diverges when $g_2 \rightarrow \infty$, contradicting the fact that $0 \leq c_{k,g_2} \leq 1$. Thus in the steady state one must have $c_{k=0,*} = 1$, but as before that leads to $c_{k,*} = 1$ for

all k which is not acceptable given the boundary condition $c_{k,*} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \pm\infty$. So we can conclude that the recursions Eq.6 lead to a non-stationary behavior, and that as g increases, $\sigma_{k,g}^2$ converges to 0. We now turn to the numerical analysis of Eq.6 to study *how* $\sigma_{k=0,g}^2$ tends to 0 with increasing g .

3.4 Numerical treatment

To treat numerically the infinite set of recursions given in Eq.6, we have to focus on a finite number of variances and in practice we consider those having index k with $|k| \leq N$, N large. Each recursion involves all k' and so, in our numerical treatment, the variances beyond the cut-off N are replaced by analytic expressions that are set by matching the values in the neighborhood of $k = \pm N$. This avoids the severe truncation error that would have followed if we had simply replaced those variances at $|k| > N$ by their limiting value. Naturally, the results need to be extrapolated to the $N = \infty$ limit as best as possible. In practice, having a finite N introduces errors that become significant when g has the same order of magnitude as N . Thus it is necessary to perform a study of the numerical behavior of $\sigma_{0,g}^2$ as a function of N . Noticing that the recursions involve a convolution, we compute the convolution using the discrete Fast Fourier transform. This allows us to treat N values up to tens of thousands on a desktop computer. We now discuss the results obtained with these numerical methods. The computer codes (R [20] scripts for implementing efficiently the numerical iterations of Eq.6 and for the corresponding analyses) are provided as Supplementary Material.

3.5 The system displays aging dynamics as the generation number increases

As mentioned before, the initial condition is $\sigma_{k,g=0}^2 = 1$, and one also has the boundary condition $\sigma_{k,g}^2 = 1$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$ for any g . For numerical purposes, we change variables and follow instead $1 - \sigma_{k,g}^2$ as a function of g . That is more convenient because then these quantities go to 0 as $|k| \rightarrow \infty$, at any fixed g , and so problems of numerical roundoff arise for much larger N and g than without that change.

Fig.2 displays our results for the first 250 variables (1- variance and $0 \leq k \leq 250$) for a number of values of g . Clearly all these quantities decrease with increasing g , but this occurs very slowly in a way typical of aging dynamics [11, 12] as evidenced by the fact that values in this figure are displayed for g values equal to powers of 2. In the context of the explanation given in the ‘‘Absence of a steady-state solution’’ section, such an aging behavior is not a surprise. Indeed, the matter added at each generation at the $k = 0$ site decreases to 0 with generations while keeping the system away from a steady state.

We also see that the errors introduced by the truncation parameter N become visible only when g is comparable to N . These slow dynamics would be quite difficult to identify in a forward simulation of a population subject to di-




Figure 2: Evolution of the first 250 variables ($1 - \sigma_{k,g}^2$ for $0 \leq k \leq 250$) at increasing g values. Note that the errors introduced by the truncation parameter N become visible when g is comparable to N .

rectional selection. In particular, to ensure small enough drift effects, it would be necessary to simulate huge population sizes.

3.6 The genetic variance decays to 0 inversely with the logarithm of generation number

The $k = 0$ variance component determines the genetic gain (cf. Eq.5) which is the main observable of interest in quantitative genetics. Our scaling analysis of $\sigma_{0,g}^2$ is summarized in Fig.3 where we display the product $\log_2(g)\sigma_{0,g}^2$ as a function of $\log_2(g)$. The curves for different values of N superpose well except that finite N effects are visible at large g , in direct analogy with what was found in Fig.2. As N increases to infinity, we see empirically that the curves tend to an envelope that is well fit to the function

$$\log_2(g)\sigma_{0,g}^2 = A + \frac{B}{\log_2(\log_2(g))\sqrt{\log_2(g)}} \quad (7)$$

with $A = 1.48$ and $B = -2.02$. From this we conclude that the genetic variance decreases to 0 as the inverse of the logarithm of g , with higher order corrections that include a logarithmic correction factor (thus a log log term) reminiscent of correction to scaling terms arising in various one-dimensional moving front problems [21].

3.7 The long term genetic gain is unbounded

Since the genetic variance goes to 0 at large g , Eq.5 shows that the gain per generation goes to zero. Nevertheless, the total gain, accumulated over generations, goes to infinity with increasing g . Indeed, by Eq.5, that total gain is α times the sum over g of the $\sigma_{0,g}^2$. The leading term in Eq.7 shows that $\sigma_{0,g}^2 \approx A/\log_2(g)$, and so it is easy to see that the corresponding series is divergent. A qualitative way to justify this property is to notice that at any g there remains genetic variance in the $\sigma_{k,g}$ at large k as in the case without linkage and that its variance can be transferred to $k = 0$ over generations. It is just a question of applying sufficiently many crossovers (generations) to recover that reservoir of variance. As a result, the reachable total genetic gains are the same whether there is linkage or not, it is just that with linkage it takes far more generations to access that reservoir and in fact one has a case of “diminishing returns” per generation: it takes more and more generations to provide a fixed genetic gain.

4 Discussion and conclusions

We have revisited the infinitesimal model, originally proposed by Fisher in 1918 [4], with the goal of determining the consequences of linkage therein. We first introduced a number of model choices which allowed us to derive exact




Figure 3: Scaling law and corrections for the genetic variance $\sigma_{k=0,g}^2$ when the number of generations g becomes large. Y axis is $\log_2(g)\sigma_{0,g}^2$ estimated using different values of N . The numerical data at finite N is shown via dots and our associated fit by the continuous curve (regions not used for the fit are indicated by a dotted line). X axis is $\log_2(g)$. The function for the fit uses two parameters A and B and is specified in Eq.7.

recursion equations (Eqs.5 and 6). Then we analyzed these equations and revealed a qualitatively different long-term behavior compared to the case without linkage: the genetic variance (the variance of G in Eq.1, equal to $\sigma_{k=0,g}^2$ in our notation) goes to 0 at large g and so does the genetic gain per generation (cf. Eq.5). The subtlety of this process likely explains why no previous work had suggested that introducing linkage might qualitatively change the behavior of the infinitesimal model. Furthermore, our analysis justifies why any approximate treatment is likely to be unreliable, while our numerical treatment shows that the corresponding dynamics exhibit aging; as a result, any simulation based on following populations of individuals will almost certainly be inconclusive. In effect, although the constraint of linkage is moderate at each generation, when considering many generations, its cumulative effect changes the long term behavior of the system in a singular way.

At the mathematical level, the origin of this singular behavior lies in the way the diffusion convolution kernel decays with distance. For an inverse power law of exponent 2 (as arises in the present case) and also for faster rates of decay (e.g., as occurs for the standard nearest-neighbor diffusion convolution kernel that was considered for pedagogical purposes in the “Absence of a steady-state solution” section), the reduction of variance produced in the low frequency modes does not diffuse away sufficiently well into the high frequency modes to prevent the ultimate vanishing of all variances at large g . Were the rate of decay *slower*, say according to an inverse power $1 + \alpha$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$), a non trivial steady state might emerge instead, but realizing that type of decay using crossovers would require both an infinite number of crossovers and introducing strong statistical dependencies between them. Interestingly, the case without linkage can be thought of as an extreme limit of such a rate of decay: the infinite number of crossovers required to break all linkage corresponds to a convolution kernel that diffuses out to infinity in an instantaneous manner, so the variance reduction produced at the level of the genetic variance is diluted across all modes in a single step, and thus there is no finite effect on any individual mode.

Our mathematical treatment took advantage of having an infinite population and an infinite number of genes as assumed by Fisher. But it also relied on several choices staying within the infinitesimal model: applying the selection step to the haploid individuals, having a single circular chromosome per individual, imposing exactly two crossovers that produce equal sized segments in the genetic recombination step, and finally selecting individuals of a given genetic value G . Treating other model choices, such as allowing multiple linear chromosomes, would certainly introduce major technical difficulties for both the mathematical and numerical analyses. Nevertheless, it should be clear that the key property is the rate at which the variance reduction (originating at the level of G during the selection step) diffuses out towards the high frequency modes (*i.e.*, the small scales at the level of the chromosomes). The power law in the corresponding diffusion convolution kernel will not be changed by allowing more crossovers (as long as they are in finite number) or by having linear chromosomes, so we expect that even in these more realistic systems the long term behavior will still see the genetic variance tend towards 0, though perhaps more

slowly. Similarly, we do not expect the choice of form of selection to affect our conclusion, even though manifestly using truncation selection leads to unmanageable recursions [8, 9]. Note that, in our analysis, for convenience we selected individuals to have a given genetic value as a way of bypassing the difficulties generated by truncation selection, but the mathematics would have been hardly affected had we selected according to a Gaussian around that value.

Lastly, coming back to the controversy of the early 20th century between the two schools of thought, namely the biometric school and the Mendelian genetics school, let us note that the biometricians expected the variance of the trait (*i.e.*, of G , *cf.* Eq.1) to converge to zero over generations. In that, they were right; but they also expected that the gain in G over generations would be bounded, and in that, they were wrong.

5 Data availability

The scripts used to generate the results ($N = 16383, 32767, 65535, 131071, 262143, 524287$ using the selection parameter $\beta = 1.6$) are provided as Supplementary Material.

Acknowledgements We thank M. Falque, F. Kutle, S. Majumdar, G. Schehr, B. Servin, A. Veber and D. de Vienne for comments, explanations and references. IPS2 benefits from the support of Saclay Plant Sciences-SPS (ANR-17-EUR-0007).

References

- [1] Jared Diamond. *The Local Origins of Domestication*, page 9–18. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [2] Yuval Noah Harari. *Sapiens: A brief history of humankind*. Random House, 2014.
- [3] Francis Galton. *Natural inheritance*, volume 42. Macmillan, 1889.
- [4] RA Fisher. The correlation between relatives on the supposition of mendelian inheritance. *Trans. Roy. Soc*, 1918.
- [5] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1930.
- [6] Nicholas H Barton, Alison M Etheridge, and Amandine Véber. The infinitesimal model: Definition, derivation, and implications. *Theoretical population biology*, 118:50–73, 2017.
- [7] Michael Turelli. Commentary: Fisher’s infinitesimal model: A story for the ages. *Theoretical population biology*, 118:46–49, 2017.
- [8] Michael Turelli and Nicholas H Barton. Dynamics of polygenic characters under selection. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 38(1):1–57, 1990.
- [9] Enrique Santiago. Linkage and the maintenance of variation for quantitative traits by mutation–selection balance: an infinitesimal model. *Genetics Research*, 71(2):161–170, 1998.
- [10] Bruce Walsh and Michael Lynch. *Evolution and selection of quantitative traits*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- [11] Leendert Cornelis Elisa Struik. *Physical aging in amorphous polymers and other materials*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [12] A Barrat, R Burioni, and M Mézard. Ageing classification in glassy dynamics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 29(7):1311, 1996.
- [13] M. G. Bulmer. The effect of selection on genetic variability. *The American Naturalist*, 6(943):201–211, 1971.
- [14] Kenneth Lange. Central limit theorems of pedigrees. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 105(1):59–66, 1978.
- [15] Nathaniel R Goodman. Statistical analysis based on a certain multivariate complex gaussian distribution (an introduction). *The Annals of mathematical statistics*, 34(1):152–177, 1963.
- [16] Bernard Picinbono. Second-order complex random vectors and normal distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 44(10):2637–2640, 1996.

- [17] Amos Lapidoth. *A foundation in digital communication*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [18] Raoul LePage, Michael Woodroffe, and Joel Zinn. Convergence to a stable distribution via order statistics. *The Annals of Probability*, 9(4):624–632, 1981.
- [19] G. Samorodnitsky and M.S. Taqqu. *Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance*. CRC Press, 1994.
- [20] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021.
- [21] Julien Berestycki, Eric Brunet, and Bernard Derrida. A new approach to computing the asymptotics of the position of fisher-kpp fronts. *Europhysics Letters*, 122(1):10001, 2018.

APPENDIX I: Fourier series of an offspring

Here we determine the coefficients of the Fourier series of an offspring’s profile as a function of those of its parents and of the angle ψ specifying the position of the crossover P_1 as represented in Fig.1. We begin with the periodic Heaviside function that is 1 in the intervals $]2n\pi, (2n + 1)\pi[$ and vanishes otherwise. Its Fourier series representation is:

$$H(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(2k + 1)} \sin [(2k + 1)\theta]$$

Let the parents in Fig.1 have the profiles $x(\theta)$ and $x'(\theta)$. Each of these profiles has a Fourier series representation as given in Eq.3; let the corresponding coefficients be X_k and X'_k . The offspring’s profile is then $x''(\theta) = x(\theta)H(\theta - \psi) + x'(\theta)H(\theta - \psi - \pi)$. Since this is linear in x and x' , the Fourier coefficients of an offspring are linear in the Fourier coefficients of its parents. Consider for instance the contribution of the first parent using its series representation:

$$x(\theta)H(\theta - \psi) = \left[\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{ik\theta} X_k \right] \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{-i}{\pi} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{e^{i(2k+1)(\theta-\psi)}}{2k + 1} \right]$$

Carrying out this product and extracting the coefficient of $\exp(ik\theta)$ gives the k th Fourier coefficient for that first parent’s contribution to the offspring:

$$\frac{X_k}{2} + \frac{-i}{\pi} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{X_{k-(2k'+1)}}{2k'+1} e^{-i(2k'+1)\psi}$$

The contribution from the second parent is obtained similarly after the replacement of X by X' and of ψ by $\psi + \pi$. Adding the contributions of both parents, we obtain that the k th Fourier coefficient of the series for the offspring is:

$$X_k'' = \frac{X_k + X_k'}{2} + \frac{-i}{\pi} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{X_{k-(2k'+1)}}{2k'+1} e^{-i(2k'+1)\psi} \\ + \frac{i}{\pi} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{X'_{k-(2k'+1)}}{2k'+1} e^{-i(2k'+1)\psi}$$

A consequence of this linear relation is that at all generations the distribution of Fourier coefficients remains multi-dimensional complex normal since their initial distribution is so.

APPENDIX II: Recursions for the variances of the Fourier coefficients

As explained in the main part of the paper, because of the rotational invariance of the distribution of profiles ($\theta \rightarrow \theta + \delta$), the (complex) covariance matrix of the Fourier coefficients (Eq.4) is diagonal. Since X_k' is a linear combination of independent random variables, its (complex) variance is just the sum of the complex variances of those variables. Let us first calculate the expectation of $\overline{X_k''} X_k''$:

$$E \left[\overline{X_k''} X_k'' \right] = \frac{E \left[\overline{X_k} X_k \right] + E \left[\overline{X_k'} X_k' \right]}{4} \\ + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\left[\overline{X_{k-(2k'+1)}} X_{k-(2k'+1)} \right]}{(2k'+1)^2} \\ + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\left[\overline{X'_{k-(2k'+1)}} X'_{k-(2k'+1)} \right]}{(2k'+1)^2}$$

In the notation of the main part of the paper, this leads to the recursion when going from one generation to the next:

$$\sigma_{k,g+1}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{k,g}^2}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi^2} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\sigma_{k-(2k'+1),g}^2}{(2k'+1)^2}$$

Using the diffusion interpretation presented in the main part of the paper, we see that half of the matter at each site is left in place while the other half is

shared across other sites according to a convolution kernel decaying inversely with the square distance on the line of (odd) integers. This convolution kernel is normalized to 1 as it should be because of the result:

$$\frac{4}{\pi^2} \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(2k' + 1)^2} = 1$$

In the context of cycles where one first selects individuals having a given value for G , then the $k = 0$ Fourier component for all individuals are first set to that value before one proceeds with the mating. This then sets the corresponding variance to 0 and so, in the recursion formula given above, $\sigma_{k=0,g}^2$ must be replaced by 0, and then one recovers Eq.6.