

Information Theory in a Darwinian Evolution Population Dynamics Model

Eddy Kwessi*

Abstract

Using information theory, we propose an estimation method for traits parameters in a Darwinian evolution model for species with one trait or multiple traits. We use the Fisher's information to obtain the errors on the estimation for one species with one or multiple traits. We perform simulations to illustrate the method.

1 Introduction

Evolution can be thought of as the dynamic changes in organisms' traits. These changes are mainly due to the environment they live in and occur through mutations or random genetic changes. Darwinian evolution was pioneered by Darwin (1859) whereby he stated his theory of natural selection as follows: *species that are best adapted to their environment would pass their traits onto their offsprings*. This can be expanded to mean that organisms from the same species have the same traits, they may compete for survival, individuals with survival traits may reproduce successfully and pass on their traits to their offsprings, and overtime, organisms that best handle variations may become a separate species. Therefore, tracking overtime variations in species traits may help better understand the evolution of these species. From a theoretical point of view, information theory can help track such changes. Indeed, given an observable random variable X depending on a parameter (or trait) θ , its Fisher's information $I(\theta)$ represents the amount of information that the random variable contains about the parameter (Lehman and Casella (1998)). Since its introduction by Fisher (Fisher (1922)), the Fisher's information has undergone a considerable amount of studies and has been applied to many areas of scientific research. For instance, it has been used to calculate non-informative Jeffrey's priors in Bayesian Statistics (Bernado and Smith (1994)), the formulation of Wald's test (Ward and Ahlquist (2015)), it is connected to the derivation of the Cramér-Rao bound of an estimator Cramér (1946); Rao (1945), it is a common feature in optimal design (Smith (1918)), machine learning, especially elastic weight consolidation (Kilrpatrick et al. (2017)), color discrimination, da Fonseca and Samengo (2016), in computational neuroscience to accurately calculate bounds of neural codes (Abbott and Dayan (1999)). It was recently used in epidemiology to asses how two different data sources affect the

*Corresponding author: Department of Mathematics, Trinity University, 1 Trinity Place, San Antonio, TX 78212, Email: ekwessi@trinity.edu

estimation of the reproductive number of SARS-Cov-2 (Parag et al. (2022)). More importantly, the Fisher's information is related to information theory via the notion of relative entropy (or information). Indeed, the Fisher's information is the Hessian matrix with respect to the parameter of the relative entropy or Kullback-Leibler divergence. In more general terms, information can be lost, stored, or gained. In evolutionary biology, information is essentially found in organisms' genomes. It is therefore expected to evolve with changes in the environment. Our interest in evolution population dynamics and Fisher's information stems from the work of Vincent et al. (2011). In it, they discussed Darwinian dynamics and evolutionary game theory. More precisely, a static game with n players is considered where player i chooses his strategy θ_i to maximize his payoff

$$f_i(\Theta), \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$. A dynamic game is then defined as an ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{x}_i = F_i(\mathbf{x}, \Theta), \quad \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \quad (1.2)$$

with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, where $F_i(\mathbf{x}, \Theta)$ is the instantaneous payoff function of player i . The static and dynamic games differ in that in the former, the goal is to maximize a player's payoff whereas in the latter, the goal is to find strategies that persist overtime. Adapting this concept to ecology in particular, in the presence of n species, the payoff function $f_i(\Theta)$ is referred to as the instantaneous per capita growth rate of a species with density x_i and common strategy or trait θ_i . To simplify the fitness of many species, Vincent and Brown (2005) introduced the notion of G -function as

$$G(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta)|_{\theta=\theta_i} = f_i(\mathbf{x}, \Theta), \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where θ is called a "virtual variable". This leads to an evolutionary equation of strategies given as

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \sigma^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta)|_{\theta=\theta_i}, \quad \text{where } g(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta) = \frac{\partial \ln(G(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta))}{\partial \theta} \quad (1.4)$$

Now consider the evolutionary population dynamical system given as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= x_i G(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta)|_{\theta=\theta_i} \\ \dot{\theta}_i &= \sigma^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \theta, \Theta)|_{\theta=\theta_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where σ^2 is the variance of the distribution of strategies (or traits)-values among phenotypes of single species, see Vincent et al. (2011). This system has a solution called evolutionary stable strategies (ESS) introduced by Smith and Price (1973) and Smith (1982). In particular, a necessary condition for the existence of an ESS is that the G -function takes on a maximum at zero with respect to θ , see Vincent and Brown (2005). Since then, there have been many studies of this model, especially its the discrete version. In particular, Ackleh et al. (2015) discussed competitive evolutionary dynamics, Cushing (2019) proposed difference equation schemes for evolutionary population dynamics, which was followed by a new approach in Mokni et al. (2020). Cushing et al. (2023) introduced a Susceptible-Infected (SI) model for a Darwinian model with evolutionary resistance. Elaydi et al. (2022) discussed the effects of evolution on the stability of competing species. In this paper, among many other things, we would like to address two questions that were raised at the end of the paper by Vincent et al. (2011), especially in the discrete case, that is:

- (i) Are there interpretable relations between the maximum of G , g , and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta} < 0$?
- (ii) Similarly for $g = 0$ and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta} > 0$?

Our literature review did not yield meaningful responses to these questions. One way to understand the importance of G -functions is in the context of random variables. Indeed, in the one-species case, if $G = G(x, \theta)$ is the density function of a random variable X depending on an unknown trait parameter θ , the amount of information that a random sample from X contains about θ can be calculated and may lead to the estimation of the unknown parameter θ . This amount of information or the Fisher's information (Lehman and Casella (1998)) can be calculated theoretically when G is known and may be estimated given an observed random sample. Since most known probability distributions in statistics are from an exponential family, the logarithm of G rather than G -itself, its first derivative g , and in some cases its second derivatives $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta}$ can be used to calculate the Fisher's information. While many mathematical questions have been answered and are being answered in the literature on Darwinian dynamics, computational aspects still lag behind. Here, we aim to remedy that by providing a statistical framework for estimating a species traits in a Darwinian model. More specifically, we will show that minimizing or maximizing the information (Fisher's information or relative) in a properly defined context may not only provide new insights onto the questions above, but would also enable the experimenter to properly estimate unknown evolution traits parameters, given the data. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we make a brief overview of Fisher's information theory as it pertains to mathematical statistics. In Section 3, we discuss Fisher's information in conjunction with discrete evolutionary population dynamics. Finally in Section 4, we make some concluding remarks.

2 Review of Fisher's Information Theory

Let $G(x, \Theta)$ be the density of a random variable X , continuous or discrete on an open set $\mathcal{X} \times \Omega \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Here $\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ is either a single parameter or a vector of parameters. We know that since $G(x, \Theta)$ is density function, then $\int_{\mathcal{X}} G(x, \Theta) dx = 1$. We also know that a given nonnegative integrable function $G_0(x, \Theta)$ defined on Ω can be made the density of random variable X by considering $G(x, \Theta) = c f_0(x, \Theta)$, where $c^{-1} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} G_0(x, \Theta) dx$.

In the sequel, we will always make the following assumptions on the function $G(x, \Theta)$:

- A_1 : The support $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : G(x, \Theta) \neq 0\}$ of G is independent of Θ .
- A_2 : $G(\cdot, \Theta)$ is nonnegative for all $\Theta \in \Omega$ and $G \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$.
- A_3 : $G(x, \cdot) \in C^2(\Omega)$, the set of continuously and twice differentiable functions of Θ , for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The first assumption puts out of consideration any uniform distribution $G(x, \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta}$, whose support is the interval $(0, \theta)$. The second assumption allows the well-definiteness of $\lambda(x, \theta) = \ln(G(x, \theta))$, its first derivative or score function $g(x, \Theta) = \nabla_{\theta} \lambda(x, \Theta)$ and its

second derivative $h(x, \Theta) = \nabla_{\Theta} g(x, \Theta) = \nabla_{\Theta}^2 \lambda(x, \Theta)$. We will denote the expected value of a random variable X as $\mathbb{E}[X]$.

Definition 2.1. Given a random variable X with density function $G(x, \Theta)$ satisfying A_1 and A_2 , the Fisher's information of X is defined as

$$I(\Theta) = \mathbb{E}_X[(g(X, \Theta))^2] = -\mathbb{E}_X[h(X, \Theta)] . \quad (2.1)$$

When Θ is a vector of more than one coordinates, the Fisher's information is a symmetric positive definite (thus invertible) matrix $I(\Theta) = (I_{kl}(\Theta))_{1 \leq k, l \leq n}$, where

$$I_{kl} = \mathbb{E}_X \left[\frac{\partial^2 \lambda(X, \Theta)}{\partial \theta_k \partial \theta_l} \right], \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k, l \leq n . \quad (2.2)$$

The Fisher's information $I(\Theta)$ represents the amount of information contained in an estimator of Θ , given data X . In that regard, it is also known as the **observed information** about Θ contained in an estimator of Θ . In fact, if X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n is a random sample from the distribution $G(x, \Theta)$, the Fisher's information contained in an estimator of Θ , given the data X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n is

$$I_n(\Theta) = nI(\Theta) .$$

We recall the following basic definitions:

Definition 2.2. Let X be a random variable depending on a vector of parameter Θ and let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be a random sample generated from X . Then

- $T = T(\Theta)$ is called an estimator of Θ based on the random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n if T is a function of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , that is, $T = T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$.
- If T is an estimator of Θ , T is called unbiased if $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Theta$.
- An unbiased estimator T is called efficient if $\text{Var}(T) = \frac{1}{I_n(\Theta)}$.

In particular, if $T = T(\Theta)$ is an estimator of Θ based on a sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , the Cramér-Rao (see for instance [Cramér \(1946\)](#); [Rao \(1945\)](#)) bound gives an estimate of the best lower bound for the variance of T as:

$$\text{Var}(T) \geq (\nabla_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}(T))^T I_n(\Theta)^{-1} (\nabla_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}(T)) . \quad (2.3)$$

Equality is obtained in (2.3) if T is efficient. If T is unbiased, then $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Theta$ and consequently, $\nabla_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}[T] = \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of ones \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, (2.3) becomes

$$\text{Var}(T) = I_n(\Theta)^{-1} . \quad (2.4)$$

Example 1: Suppose X is a random variable with distribution $f(x, \theta) = \theta e^{-\theta x}$, where $\theta > 0$. Then we have that $\lambda(x, \theta) = \ln(\theta) - \theta x$, $g(x, \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} - x$, and $h(x, \theta) = -\frac{1}{\theta^2}$. It follows that $I(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_X[h(x, \theta)] = \frac{1}{\theta^2}$ and $I_n(\theta) = \frac{n}{\theta^2}$. If we now consider a random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n from X , and $T = T(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, we note that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \theta$, so

that $\mathbb{E}[T] = \theta$. Thus, T is an unbiased estimator of θ and $\frac{d}{d\theta} T = 1$. Moreover, $\text{Var}(T) = \frac{\theta^2}{n}$. We then verify from (2.4) that indeed we have $\text{Var}(T) = \frac{\theta^2}{n} = \frac{1}{I_n(\theta)}$. Consequently, accurate estimates of Θ have large Fisher's information (matrix) components whereas inaccurate ones have small Fisher's information components.

3 Evolution population dynamics and information theory

3.1 Single population model with one trait

Consider the following discrete evolutionary dynamical model

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1} &= x_t G(x_t, \theta_t, u_t) \\ \theta_{t+1} &= \theta_t + \sigma^2 g(x_t, \theta_t, u_t) \end{cases}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $G(x, \theta, u) = b(\theta)e^{-c_u(\theta)x}$ where $b(\theta) = b_0 e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{2w^2}}$ and $c_u(\theta) = c_0 e^{-\kappa(\theta-u)}$, for a constant u and for some positive constants σ (speed of evolution), b_0 (initial birth rate), c_0 (competition constant), κ , and w (standard deviation of the distribution of birth rates), and for a differentiable function $c_u(\theta)$ of θ and positive and continuous function $b(\theta)$. This system has nontrivial fixed points (x^*, θ^*) if they satisfy the equations

$$\begin{cases} 1 &= b(\theta)e^{-c_u(\theta)x} \\ \frac{1}{b(\theta)} &= c'_u(\theta)x. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

This can further be reduced to the condition on $b(\theta)$ and $c_u(\theta)$ given by

$$\frac{\ln(b(\theta))}{c_u(\theta)} = \frac{1}{b(\theta)c'_u(\theta)}. \quad (3.3)$$

The theorem below shows how to obtain the Fisher's information of the above system as a function of the system's parameters.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Gamma_u(\theta) = \frac{b(\theta)}{c_u(\theta)}$. Then the Fisher's information of this system is constant and given by*

$$I(\theta) = \frac{1}{\omega^2} + \kappa^2 \Gamma_u(\theta). \quad (3.4)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A_1 .

The Corollary below shows that the Fisher's information has a maximum value.

Corollary 3.2. *The Fisher's information $I(\theta)$ attains its maximum value I_{max} for $\theta_{max} = w^2 \kappa$ and the maximum value is*

$$I_{max} = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 \frac{b_0}{c_0} e^{\frac{1}{2}(w\kappa)^2 - \kappa u}. \quad (3.5)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A_2 .




Figure 1: The blue curve represents the Fisher's Information in equation (3.4) with its maximum value represented by the red dashed line, for $w = 7$; $\kappa_1 = 0.5$; $u = 0.02$; $\frac{b_0}{c_0} = 10^{-4}$.

In the proposition below, we give precise conditions for the existence of nontrivial fixed points of the system above.

Proposition 3.3. *Let*

$$\xi_1 = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} + 2w^2 \ln(b_0) .$$

If $\xi_1 < 0$, then the Darwinian system (3.7) does not have a nontrivial critical point.

If $\xi_1 = 0$, then the Darwinian system has a unique nontrivial fixed point (x_, θ_*) given as*

$$x_* = \frac{\ln(b_0) - \frac{\theta_*}{2w^2}}{c_0 e^{-\kappa(\theta_* - u)}}, \quad \theta_* = -\frac{1}{\kappa} .$$

If $\xi_1 > 0$, then the Darwinian system has two non trivial fixed points (x_{+}, θ_{*+}) and (x_{*-}, θ_{*-}) given by*

$$x_{*\pm} = \frac{\ln(b_0) - \frac{\theta_{*\pm}}{2w^2}}{c_0 e^{-\kappa(\theta_{*\pm} - u)}}, \quad \theta_{*\pm} = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \pm \sqrt{\xi_0} .$$

Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.1 are important in that of when $\theta_t \rightarrow \theta_*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then by continuity of the function $I(\theta)$ with respect to θ , we will have $I(\theta_t) \rightarrow I(\theta_*)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This means that the Fisher's information, overtime, will be maximized at the critical point (x_*, θ_*) of the dynamical system. Therefore, for estimation purposes, the reciprocal of $I(\theta_*)$ will be the smallest variance for any unbiased estimator of the trait θ .

In Figure 2 below, we use the following parameters: $w = 3; \kappa = 3; b_0 = 10; c_0 = 0.5; u = 1, \sigma = 5, n = 750, x_0 = 1, \theta_0 = 10$.




Figure 2: In **(a)**, represented is the time series of x_t . It shows a convergence to $x^* \approx 20.789 \times 10^5$ (blue dashed line). In **(b)**, represented is the time series of θ_t , showing a convergence to $\theta_{*+} \approx 6.113$ (blue dashed line). Figure **(c)** represents the time series of the Fisher's information $I(\theta_t)$, showing a convergence to $I(\theta_{*+}) \approx 345.43 \times 10^5$ (red dashed line). Figure **(d)** is the plot of $I(\theta_t)$ versus θ_t , showing that once the fixed point θ_{*+} is reached, the Fisher's information is maximized. This is illustrated by the intersection between the blue and red dashed lines.

Special case:

We will now discuss the particular case of an exponential distribution, that is, $b(\theta) = c_u(\theta) = \theta$. Clearly, the condition (3.3) is satisfied with $\theta = \theta_* =: e$ and $x = x_* := e^{-1}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, \theta) &= \theta e^{-\theta x} \\ \lambda(x, \theta) &= \ln(\theta) - \theta x \\ g(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{\theta} - x, \\ h(x, \theta) &= -\frac{1}{\theta^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

This implies that $I(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_X[h(X, \theta)] = \frac{1}{\theta^2}$.

It follows that there are equilibrium fixed points: the extinction equilibrium (trivial point) $E_0 = (0, 0)$ and the interior equilibrium (nontrivial point) $E_1 = (e^{-1}, e)$. In Figure 3 below, we represent functions $G(x, \theta)$, $F(x, \theta = xG(x, \theta))$, and $\lambda(x, \theta)$ for $\theta = \frac{3}{2}$. This shows that $\lambda(x, \theta)$ is minimized where $G(x, \theta)$ is maximized, providing a clue as to the relation between the maximum of G and the critical points of g and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta}$. Another clue can be found in Figure 4 below.




Figure 3: This figure shows $F(x, \theta) := xG(x, \theta)$ in blue, $G(x, \theta)$ in black and $\lambda(x, \theta)$ in red for $\theta = 1.5$. The green dots represent the intersection between the vertical $x = \frac{1}{\theta} = \frac{2}{3}$ and these curves. We observe that $G(x, \theta)$ is maximized at the same point x where $\lambda(x, \theta)$ is minimized (green dots) and vice versa (red dots).




Figure 4: In **(a)**, represented is the time series of x_t in the special case above. It shows a convergence to $x^* = e^{-1}$ (blue dashed line). In **(b)**, represented is the time series of θ_t , showing a convergence to $\theta_{*+} = e$ (blue dashed line). Figure **(c)** represents the time series of the Fisher's information $I_n(\theta_t)$, showing a convergence to $I(\theta_*) \approx 0.125$ (red dashed line) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Figure **(d)** is the plot of $I(\theta_t)$ versus θ_t , showing that once the fixed point $\theta_{*+} = e$ is reached, the Fisher's information is maximized. This is illustrated by the intersection between the blue and red dashed lines.

From a dynamical systems' perspective, it means that X_t , the value of X at time t , is generated from the distribution $G(x, \theta)$ and used to calculate the value of X_{t+1} . Therefore, the role of the first choice of θ is to initialize the dynamical system. Once the system is initialized for X_t , we can use an information theory approach to provide an estima-

for $T(\theta)$ of θ_t , the value of θ at time t . That estimator, if efficient, will have variance $I_n(\theta_t)^{-1}$. We can then use the dynamical system (3.7) to estimate θ_{t+1} , and the Fisher's information will provide its variance. We note that θ_{t+1} will only be an estimate of the true value and therefore will carry an error as t changes. It is therefore expected that at the non trivial critical point (ESS) (x^*, θ^*) of the dynamical system, the estimator $T(\theta)$ converges to θ^* and the variance of $T(\theta)$ converges to $I_n(\theta_*)^{-1}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Figure 5 below is an illustration of this fact for $G(x, \theta) = \theta e^{-\theta x}$.




Figure 5: Values of $T_n(\theta_t)$ (dashed line) for two different starting values of θ , each with their 95% confidence bands (colored shaded areas). In each cases, $T_n(\theta_t)$ converges to e (light dashed line) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. When n is large as in (c) and (d), $I_n(\theta)^{-1}$ becomes smaller and so is the width of the confidence interval.

Indeed, we generated two random samples of size $n = 50$ (Figure 5 (a) and (b)) and $n = 250$ (Figure 5 (c) and (d)) with $t = 1, 2, \dots, m$ where $m = 10$ and $\sigma = 0.04$ from exponential distributions with respective initial parameters $\theta_0 = 0.2, 2.13$. We choose $T_n(\theta_t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ which is known to be an efficient estimator of θ . The dashed lines represent the respective values of $T_n(\theta_t)$, and the black lines represents their 95% confidence intervals $(T_n(\theta_t) - 1.96I_n(\theta_t)^{-1}, T_n(\theta_t) + 1.96I_n(\theta_t)^{-1})$. This shows in particular that on average $T_n(\theta_t)$ converges to e (dashed line), the fixed point of the dynamical system as expected from above. It also shows that as the Fisher's formation gets larger, the variance of the estimator gets smaller and thus the width of confidence interval gets smaller and quickly approaches zero as in Figure 5 (c) and (d).

Remark 3.4. *We observe that convergence of θ_t towards e as predicted depends on choosing appropriate value of σ . Large values of σ will definitely make the system unstable as oscillations will slowly and increasingly occur, see Figure 6 below.*




Figure 6: Times series of a Darwinian model when σ is large. We observe that there are oscillations making the critical point unstable (blue dashed line).

Discussion

Assumption A_1 is important in that we only require that G be nonnegative and $G \in L^1(\Omega)$, which guarantees that it can be transformed into the density of a random variable. It does not however guarantees that we can easily obtain a sample from it! If G happens to be a classical distribution (normal, exponential, t-distribution, Weibull, etc.), then there are sampling methods already available. If G is has a non-classic expression, we may have to resort to either the Probability Integral Transform (see Theorem 2.1.10, p.54 in [Casella and Berger \(2002\)](#)) or to Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) to obtain a sample, which sometime are themselves onerous in time. Obtaining an efficient estimator of θ is easily done when G is a classic distribution. While efficiency would be great, it may not be

necessary since overtime, the estimator would still converge, albeit slowly, to the fixed point of θ . We observe that estimates we obtain in this case are point estimates of $T_n(\theta_t)$ (mean, median, etc.), albeit, at each time t . A Bayesian estimate is also possible, provided that the initial distribution of θ_0 be selected from a well-defined Jeffrey's prior. As for answers to the questions raised in the introduction, we can say based on the above that the set of points (x, θ) where $G(x, \theta)$ is maximized at the same where $\ln(G(x, \theta))$ is minimized, and contains all the critical points of the function G . This can be written formally as $\text{Arg max}_{\theta \in \Omega} G(x, \theta) = \text{Arg min}_{\theta \in \Omega} \ln(G(x, \theta)) \supseteq \{(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Omega : g(x, \theta) = 0\}$.

3.2 Single population model with multiple traits

Now suppose we are in the presence of one species with density x possessing n traits given by the vector $\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ and a vector $\mathbf{U} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$.

H_1) We assume that $b(\Theta) = b_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_i^2}{2w_i^2}\right)$ is the joint distribution of the independent traits θ_i , each with mean 0 and variance w_i^2 .

H_2) We also assume that $c_{\mathbf{U}}(\Theta) = c_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right)$.

H_3) We assume that density of x_t is given as $G(x, \Theta, \mathbf{U}) = b(\Theta) \exp(-c_{\mathbf{U}}(\Theta)x)$ at $t = 1$. Under H_1, H_2 , and H_3 , we will consider the discrete dynamical system

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1} &= x_t G(x_t, \Theta_t, U_t) \\ \Theta_{t+1} &= \Theta_t + \Sigma g(x_t, \Theta_t, U_t), \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} & \cdots & \sigma_{1n} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} & \cdots & \sigma_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{n1} & \sigma_{n2} & \cdots & \sigma_{nn} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.8)$$

Remark 3.5. *There are couple of distinctions between this model and the ones encountered in the recent literature, see for instance [Cushing \(2019\)](#); [Elaydi et al. \(2022\)](#). Firstly, the matrix Σ considered here is not necessarily symmetric ($\sigma_{ij} \neq \sigma_{ji}$). Secondly, the competition function $c_{\mathbf{U}}(\Theta)$, depends subtly on a vector \mathbf{U} that needs not be the mean of Θ as it is often considered. We note however that when $\Theta = \mathbf{U}$, then $c_{\mathbf{U}}(\Theta) = c_0$. Ecologically, this happens when competition is maximal. This leads to recover the uncoupled Darwinian model (2) in [Elaydi et al. \(2022\)](#).*

The result below shows how to obtain the Fisher's information of the Darwinian dynamical system (3.7).

Theorem 3.6. Let $\Gamma_U(\Theta) = \frac{b(\Theta)}{c_U(\Theta)}$. Then under assumptions H_1, H_2 , and H_3 , the dynamical system above has Fisher's information matrix $I(\Theta)$ is given as

$$I(\Theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{w_1^2} + \kappa_1^2 \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \cdots & \kappa_1 \kappa_n \Gamma_U(\Theta) \\ \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \frac{1}{w_2^2} + \kappa_2^2 \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \cdots & \kappa_2 \kappa_n \Gamma_U(\Theta) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \kappa_1 \kappa_n \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \kappa_2 \kappa_n \Gamma_U(\Theta) & \cdots & \frac{1}{w_n^2} + \kappa_n^2 \Gamma_U(\Theta) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.9)$$

The Proof of this result can be found in Appendix B.

A necessary condition for the existence of an extinction equilibria $(0, \mathbf{0})$ for this system is that $\det(\Sigma) \neq 0$. Letting $\rho(A)$ represent the spectral radius of matrix A , it was proved in Cushing (2019) that if $\rho(\mathbf{I} + \Sigma h(0, \mathbf{0})) < 1$ and $b_0 < 1$, then the extinction equilibria is asymptotically stable and unstable if $\rho(\mathbf{I} + \Sigma h(0, \mathbf{0})) < 1$ and $b_0 > 1$, or if $\rho(\mathbf{I} + \Sigma h(0, \mathbf{0})) > 1$ for all $b_0 > 0$. This is particularly true if Σ is diagonally dominant and for $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{21} = 0$. This system admits a nontrivial fixed point (positive equilibria) (x_*, Θ_*) if $G(x_*, \Theta_*) = 1$ and $\det(\Sigma) = 0$. In the proposition below, we give a more precise characterization of nontrivial fixed points of the system (3.13).

Proposition 3.7. Assume $\det(\Sigma) = 0$ and $\sigma_{ii} \neq 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Put

$$\mu_{ij} = \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{\sigma_{ii}}, \quad \nu_j = \kappa_j + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n \mu_{ij} \kappa_i,$$

and given $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$$\xi_{nj} := \frac{1}{\nu_j^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_j^2} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n \frac{\mu_{ij}^2}{w_i^2} \right) + 2 \ln(b_0).$$

If $\xi_{nj} < 0$, then there is nonon trivial solution for the system (3.7).

Now suppose $\xi_{nj} \geq 0$. Then the system (3.7) has a nontrivial solution (x_*, Θ_*) given as

$$x_* = \frac{\ln(b_0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\theta_{i*})^2}{2w_i^2}}{c_0 \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i (\theta_{i*} - u_i) \right)}, \quad (3.10)$$

and

(i) if $\xi_{nj} = 0$, then $\Theta_* = \left(-\frac{1}{\nu}, -\frac{\mu_2}{\nu}, \dots, -\frac{\mu_n}{\nu} \right)$,

(ii) if $\xi_{nj} > 0$, then the coordinates of the vector Θ_* are points that lie on the curve of equation

$$\frac{1}{w_j^2} \left(\theta_j + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n \frac{1}{w_i^2} \left(\theta_i + \frac{\mu_{ij}}{\nu_j} \right)^2 - \xi_{nj} = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix C.

Special case: single species with two traits

Here we consider the particular case of system of one species with two traits, namely the coupled dynamical system

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1} &= x_t G(x_t, \theta_{1,t}, \theta_{2,t}) \\ \theta_{1,t+1} &= \theta_{1,t} + \sigma_{11}g_1(x_t, \theta_{1,t}, \theta_{2,t}) + \sigma_{12}g_2(x_t, \theta_{1,t}, \theta_{2,t}) \\ \theta_{2,t+1} &= \theta_{2,t} + \sigma_{21}g_1(x_t, \theta_{1,t}, \theta_{2,t}) + \sigma_{22}g_2(x_t, \theta_{1,t}, \theta_{2,t}) \end{cases} . \quad (3.12)$$

The fixed points $(x_*, \theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$ of this model are solutions of the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} xG(x, u, v) &= x \\ \Sigma g(x, u, v) &= 0 \end{cases} , \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} , \quad \text{for } (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 .$$

Corollary 3.8. *Assume $\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{22} \neq 0$ and $\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} = \sigma_{12}\sigma_{21}$. We put*

$$\mu_1 = \frac{\sigma_{21}}{\sigma_{22}}, \quad \mu_2 = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma_{11}}, \quad \nu = \kappa_1 + \mu_2\kappa_2 ,$$

and

$$\xi_2 := \frac{1}{\nu^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_1^2} + \frac{\mu_2^2}{w_2^2} \right) + 2 \ln(b_0) .$$

If $\xi_2 < 0$, then there is no non trivial solution for the system (3.12).

Now suppose $\xi_2 \geq 0$. Then the system (3.12) has a non trivial solution $(x_*, \theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$ given as

$$x_* = \frac{\ln(b_0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\theta_{i*})^2}{2w_i^2}}{c_0 \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i (\theta_{i*} - u_i) \right)} , \quad \text{for } n = 2 . \quad (3.14)$$

and

(i) if $\xi_2 = 0$, then $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*}) = \left(-\frac{1}{\nu}, -\frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)$,

(ii) if $\xi_2 > 0$, then $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$ are points that lie on the ellipse of equation

$$\frac{\left(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2}{a^2} + \frac{\left(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)^2}{b^2} = 1, \quad \text{where } a = w_1 \sqrt{\xi_2} \text{ and } b = w_2 \sqrt{\xi_2} . \quad (3.15)$$

In Figure 7 below, we illustrate Proposition 3.8 for $x_0 = 1, \theta_{10} = 3; \theta_{20} = 5; w_1 = 4; w_2 = 1; \kappa_1 = 3; \kappa_2 = 0.5, \sigma_{11} = 0.1; \sigma_{21} = 1; \sigma_{12} = 2; \sigma_{22} = 2; u_1 = 3; u_2 = 0, c_0 = 0.1$. We verify that $\mu_1 = \sigma_{21}/\sigma_{22} = 0.5$ and $\mu_2 = \sigma_{12}/\sigma_{11} = 2$. Therefore, $\mu_1\mu_2 = 1$, that is, $\det(\Sigma) = 0$. We also have that $\nu = 4$ and that $\xi_2 \approx 4.86 > 0$. Hence according to proposition 3.8 above, $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$ is expected to be on the ellipse centered as $(-1/\nu, \mu_2/\mu) = (-0.25, -0.5)$ with respective major and minor axis lengths $a = w_1\sqrt{\xi} \approx 8.82$ and $b = w_2\sqrt{\xi} \approx 2.21$.

The parameters for Figure 8 are the same except for $\theta_{10} = 3, \theta_{20} = 1$ and x_0 is generated from an exponential distribution with parameters $c_{\mathcal{U}}(\Theta) = c_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_{i0} - u_i)\right)$.




Figure 7: In **(a)**, the solid curve represents the dynamics of x_t in the system (3.12) above. The dashed line represents the nontrivial equilibrium point x_* . The blue line represent the value of x_* as given in equation (5.3), using the values of $\theta_{1*} \approx 3.873$ and $\theta_{2*} \approx 1.873$ obtained as nontrivial fixed points from the last two equations in (3.12). That the blue line and the dashed coincide is a proof of the first part of the Proposition above. In **(b)** and **(c)**, the solid curves represents the dynamics of $\theta_{1,t}$ and $\theta_{2,t}$ respectively. The dashed lines line represent the nontrivial fixed points $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$. In **(d)**, the blue curve represents the ellipse given in equation (3.15) above, with center $(-1/\nu, -\mu_2/\nu)$. The red dot represents the nontrivial fixed $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$. This point almost lies on the ellipse (the discrepancy is due to an accumulation of error) is a proof of the second part of Proposition 3.7 above.




Figure 8: In (a), represented in black are 100 trajectories of x_t with a starting point selected at random from an exponential distribution with parameter $c_u(\theta)$. The red curve represents their average over time converging to $x_* \approx 1.417$. In (b), represented in light-blue are the 95% confidence bands for the corresponding trajectories of $\theta_{1,t}$. The red curve represents their average and we verify that they all converge to $\theta_{1*} \approx 3.083$. We note that these confidence bands are constructed using the Fisher's information as $\overline{\theta_{2,t}} \pm 1.96/\sqrt{I_{11}(\Theta_t)}$, where $\overline{\theta_{1,t}}$ is the average at time t . Similarly in (c), represented in light-blue are the 95% confidence bands for $\theta_{2,t}$ and the corresponding sample average in red. They converge to $\theta_{2*} \approx 1.083$. In (d), represented is the ellipse given in equation (3.15) above. We verify that the point $(\theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*})$ is on the ellipse and that the value of x^* obtained from equation (5.3) is the same as convergence value of x_t .

Discussion

An important remark about Theorem 3.6 is that we assume the vector \mathbf{U} is given. In fact, if the vector Θ were given, the same technique could have been used for the estimation of \mathbf{U} , up to a negative sign on the Fisher's information matrix. Having \mathbf{U} be different from the average of Θ allows for generalization in that, $\Theta - \mathbf{U}$ represents the difference of a set of traits Θ from a given set of traits \mathbf{U} , which needs not be the average of Θ . One thing we have not insisted much in this paper is the type of estimator of Θ itself. We do not need to specify in particular which estimator to use, since the inverse of the Fisher's information is smallest variance for all estimators. One consequence of Proposition 3.7 above is that once we have estimated Θ_* , we can deduce the value of x_* . The results above also show that there may be many equilibria when $\xi_n > 0$. In the context of evolution and natural selection, one should focus on equilibria that ensure better adaptation to environmental fluctuations. This specifically means adding stochasticity to the model by means of, say a Wiener process and finding traits that ensure for example that on average, the species density is bounded away from the extinction equilibrium. Another possibility could be to focus on equilibria that maximize the species density in order to increase the prospects of survivability of the species. This can be done using a constraint optimization problem $\max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{u})$ where $f(\mathbf{u}) = x_*$ subject to the constraint that the point \mathbf{u} be on the curve defined in equation (3.11). In the particular case where $n = 2$ with $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$, we have

$$f(u, v) := \frac{\ln(b_0) - \frac{u^2}{2w_1^2} - \frac{v^2}{2w_2^2}}{c_0 \exp(-\kappa_1(u - u_i) - \kappa_2(v - u_i))}.$$

However, the form of the function $f(u, v)$ makes it a very challenging problem. Rewriting, we have

$$f(u, v) := c_0^{-1} \left(\ln(b_0) - \frac{u^2}{2w_1^2} - \frac{v^2}{2w_2^2} \right) e^{\kappa_1(u - u_i) + \kappa_2(v - u_i)}.$$

We observe that for positive κ_1 and κ_2 , the function $(u, v) \mapsto e^{\kappa_1(u - u_i) + \kappa_2(v - u_i)}$ is a positive and increasing function of u and v . Therefore, maximizing $f(u, v)$ amounts to maximizing

$$f_*(u, v) = \ln(b_0) - \frac{u^2}{2w_1^2} - \frac{v^2}{2w_2^2}. \quad (3.16)$$

Geometrically, this is the equation of a paraboloid that bends down. Therefore, the constraint optimization amounts to finding the points of intersection between a paraboloid and an ellipse. This means there can be between 0 and 4 points of intersection. Finally, let us observe that the expression of x^* in the case of multiple traits is just a generalization of the case of one trait. In fact, the first equation in the system (3.2) can be written as $x^* = \frac{\ln(b(\theta))}{c_u(\theta)}$. We see that this is similar to the expression of x^* given in equation (5.3) for two traits, which naturally generalizes to the case of one species with $n \geq 2$ traits.

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have proposed a way of estimating traits coefficients in a Darwinian evolution population dynamics model using a Fisher's information matrix. In particular, we proposed how to characterize uncertainty on the estimation process. We have discussed specifically the cases of one species with one trait and one species with multiple traits. The case of multiple species with one or more traits is certainly an interesting one to tackle and is left as future research. We have proposed a relationship between a G-function, its natural logarithm, and its derivative g . A bi-product of our work provide a precise characterization of nontrivial fixed points of the model. We showed that once the critical density x^* has been found, the set of critical traits Θ_* lie on a well-defined curve in \mathbb{R}^n . On the other hand, if the set critical traits Θ_* is given, there may be a unique critical density x_* for the Darwinian system which is not necessarily appropriate for the survival of the species. Another approach to the estimation of traits parameters would be to use modern machine learning techniques. Indeed, traits parameters may be estimated by minimizing the relative information or Kullback-Leibler divergence in a Darwinian evolution population model using either a classical gradient ascent or a stochastic gradient ascent. This may require identification of appropriate weights for the minimization process. In both cases, the procedure has to be done taking into account supervised or unsupervised learning environments. An extension of this work would be to add stochasticity in the form of Wiener process to the model in order to study strong persistence on average, and the existence of global solutions and stationary distributions.

Bibliography

- L. F. Abbott and P. Dayan. The effect of correlated variability on the accuracy of a population code. *Neural Computations*, 11(1):91–101, 1999.
- A. S. Ackleh, J. M. Cushing, and P. L. Salceneau. On the dynamics of evolutionary competition models. *Natural Resource Modelling*, 28(4):380–397, 2015.
- J. M. Bernardo and A. F. M Smith. *Bayesian Theory*. John Wiley and Sons, 1994.
- G. Casella and R. L. Berger. *Statistical Inference*. Cengage, 2nd edition, 2002.
- H. Cramér. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1946.
- J. M. Cushing. Difference equations as models of evolutionary population dynamics. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 13(1):103–127, 2019.
- J. M. Cushing, J. Park, A Farrell, and N. Chitnis. Treatment of outcome in an si model with evolutionary resistance: a darwinian model for the evolutionary resistance. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 17(1):2255061, 2023.
- M. da Fonseca and I. Samengo. Derivation of human chromatic discrimination ability from an information-theoretical notion of distance in color space. *Neural Computations*, 28(12):2628–2655, 2016.

- C. Darwin. *On the origin of species by means of natural selection*. John Murray, Albe-marble Street, London, 1859.
- S. Elaydi, Y. Kang, and R. Luis. The effects of evolution on the stability of competing species. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 16(1):816–839, 2022.
- R. A. Fisher. On the mathematical foundation of theoretical statistics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Serie A*, 222:594–604, 1922.
- J. Kilkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quand, and T. Ramalho. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
- E. L. Lehman and G. Casella. *Theory of Point Estimation*. Springer, 2nd edition, 1998.
- K. Mokni, S. Elaydi, and A. Eladdadi. Discrete evolutionary population models: a new approach. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 14(1):454–478, 2020.
- K.V. Parag, C. A. Donnelly, and A. E. Zarebski. Quantifying the information in noisy epidemic curves. *Nature Computational Science*, 2(9):584–594, 2022.
- C. Rao. Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society.*, 37:81–89, 1945. Calcutta Mathematical Society.
- K. Smith. On the standard deviations of adjusted and interpolated values of an observed polynomial function and its constants and the guidance they give towards a proper choice of the distribution of observations. *Biometrika*, 1:1–85, 1918.
- M. Smith. *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- M. Smith and G. R. Price. The logic of animal conflict. *Nature*, 246:15–18, 1973.
- T. L. Vincent and J. S. Brown. *Evolutionary Game Theory, Natural Selection, and Darwinian Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- T. L. Vincent, T. L. S. Vincent, and Y. Cohen. Darwinian dynamics and evolutionary game theory. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 5(3):215–226, 2011.
- M. D. Ward and J. Ahlquist. *Maximum Likelihood for Social Science: Strategies for Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. ISBN ISBN 978-1-316-63682-4.

5 Appendix

5.1 Appendix A_1 : Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. We have that $\lambda(x, \theta) = \ln(G(x, \theta)) = \ln(b_0) - \frac{\theta^2}{2w^2} - c_0 x e^{-\kappa(\theta-u)}$.

It follows that

$$g(x, \theta) = -\frac{\theta}{w^2} + \kappa c_0 x e^{-\kappa(\theta-u)}$$

$$= -\frac{\theta}{w^2} + \kappa c_u(\theta)x ,$$

and

$$h(x, \theta) = -\frac{1}{w^2} - \kappa^2 c_0 x e^{-\kappa(\theta-u)} .$$

From Definition 2.1 above, it follows that

$$I(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_X[h(X, \theta)] = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[-\frac{1}{w^2} - \kappa^2 c_u(\theta)X \right] = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 c_u(\theta)\mathbb{E}[X] .$$

We observe that X has probability distribution $G(x, \theta) = b(\theta)e^{-c_u(\theta)x}$, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} xG(x, \theta)dx \\ &= \frac{b(\theta)}{c_u(\theta)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} x c_u(\theta) e^{-c_u(\theta)x} dx \\ &= \frac{b(\theta)}{c_u(\theta)^2} . \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$I(\theta) = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 c_u(\theta) \frac{b(\theta)}{c_u(\theta)^2} = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 \frac{b(\theta)}{c_u(\theta)} = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 \Gamma(\theta) . \quad (5.1)$$

This ends the proof of the Theorem. \square

5.2 Appendix A₂: Proof of Corollary 3.2

Suppose $\frac{b_0}{c_0} = \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{2\pi w\kappa}} e^{\kappa u - \frac{(w\kappa)^2}{2}}$. From equation (5.1) above, we have that

$$I(\theta) = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 \frac{b_0}{c_0} e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{2w^2} + \kappa(\theta-u)} .$$

Completing the square, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\theta^2}{2w^2} + \kappa(\theta - u) &= -\frac{1}{2w^2} [\theta^2 - 2w^2\kappa\theta + 2w^2\kappa u] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2w^2} [(\theta - w^2\kappa)^2 - w^4\kappa^2 + 2w^2\kappa u] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2w^2} [(\theta - w^2\kappa)^2] + \frac{1}{2}(w\kappa)^2 - \kappa u . \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$I(\theta) = \frac{1}{w^2} + \kappa^2 \frac{b_0}{c_0} e^{\frac{1}{2}(w\kappa)^2 - \kappa u} e^{-\frac{1}{2w^2} [(\theta - w^2\kappa)^2]} .$$

From the given expression of $\frac{b_0}{c_0}$ above, it follows that that

$$I(\theta) = \frac{1}{w^2} + \frac{1}{w\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2w^2} [(\theta - w^2\kappa)^2]} .$$

5.3 Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 3.6

Proof. Let $b(\Theta) = b_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_i^2}{2w_i^2}\right)$ and $c_U(\Theta) = c_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right)$.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, \Theta) &= b_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_i^2}{2w_i^2} - c_0 x \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right)\right) \\ &= b(\Theta) e^{-c_U(\Theta)x}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we can deduct

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(x, \Theta) &= \ln(b_0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_i^2}{2w_i^2} - c_0 x \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right) \\ &= \ln(b(\Theta)) - x c_U(\Theta). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $g(x, \Theta)$ is the vector given as

$$g(x, \Theta) := (g_i(x, \Theta))_{i=1, \dots, n} := \left(-\frac{\theta_i}{w_i^2} + c_0 \kappa_i x \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right) \right)_{i=1, 2, \dots, n}.$$

Hence, $h(x, \Theta)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix given by

$$h(x, \Theta) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11}(x, \Theta) & g_{12}(x, \Theta) & \cdots & g_{1n}(x, \Theta) \\ g_{21}(x, \Theta) & g_{22}(x, \Theta) & \cdots & g_{2n}(x, \Theta) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ g_{n1}(x, \Theta) & g_{n2}(x, \Theta) & \cdots & g_{nn}(x, \Theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$g_{ii}(x, \Theta) = \frac{\partial^2 \lambda}{\partial \theta_i^2} = -\frac{1}{w_i^2} - c_0 \kappa_i^2 x \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right) = -\frac{1}{w_i^2} - \kappa_i^2 c_U(\Theta) x.$$

and

$$g_{ij}(x, \Theta) = \frac{\partial^2 \lambda}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} = -c_0 \kappa_i \kappa_j x \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_i - u_i)\right) = \kappa_i \kappa_j c_U(\Theta) x.$$

We can deduct that $I(\Theta)$ is the $n \times n$ matrix given as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{11}(\Theta) & I_{12}(\Theta) & \cdots & I_{1n}(\Theta) \\ I_{21}(\Theta) & I_{22}(\Theta) & \cdots & I_{2n}(\Theta) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ I_{n1}(\Theta) & I_{n2}(\Theta) & \cdots & I_{nn}(\Theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$I_{ii}(\Theta) = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\frac{\partial^2 \lambda(X, \Theta)}{\partial \theta_i^2} \right] = \frac{1}{w_i^2} + \kappa_i^2 c_U(\Theta) \mathbb{E}[X].$$

Since X has distribution $G(x, \Theta)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} x G(x, \Theta) dx \\ &= \frac{b(\Theta)}{c_U(\Theta)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} x c_U(\Theta) e^{-c_U(\Theta)x} dx \\ &= \frac{b(\Theta)}{c_U(\Theta)} \cdot \frac{1}{c_U(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that

$$I_{ii}(\Theta) = \frac{1}{w_i^2} + \kappa_i^2 \frac{b(\Theta)}{c_U(\Theta)} = \frac{1}{w_i^2} + \kappa_i^2 \Gamma_U(\Theta).$$

Likewise, for $i \neq j$,

$$I_{ij} = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\frac{\partial^2 \lambda(X, \Theta)}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right] = \kappa_i \kappa_j c_u(\theta) \mathbb{E}[X] = \kappa_i \kappa_j \frac{b(\Theta)}{c_U(\Theta)} = \kappa_i \kappa_j \Gamma_U(\Theta).$$

□

5.4 Appendix C: Proof of Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 3.8

Proof. The Proof of Proposition 3.7 is easy generalization from the two traits model.

First, assume that we are in the presence of two traits.

We have that

$$\det(\Sigma) = 0 \iff \sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} = \sigma_{12}\sigma_{21} \iff \mu_1\mu_2 = 1.$$

The system in (3.12) has non trivial solution if $\Sigma g(x, \Theta) = 0$, that is,

$$\begin{cases} g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) &= 0 \\ \mu_1 g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) &= 0 \end{cases}. \quad (5.2)$$

We will show in the sequel that either of the equations in (5.2) can be used to characterize the solutions (θ_1, θ_2) . Let $H = c_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_{i*} - u_i)\right)$, for $n = 2$. From the first equation in (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_*, \theta_{1*}, \theta_{2*}) = 1 &\iff b_0 \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_{i*}^2}{2w_i^2} - c_0 x_* \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_{i*} - u_i)\right)\right) = 1 \\ &\iff b_0 = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_{i*}^2}{2w_i^2} + c_0 x_* \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i(\theta_{i*} - u_i)\right)\right) \\ &\iff b_0 = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_{i*}^2}{2w_i^2} + x_* H\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\iff \ln(b_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_{i*}^2}{2w_i^2} + x_*H.$$

It therefore follows that

$$x^* = \frac{\ln(b_0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta_{i*}^2}{2w_i^2}}{H}. \quad (5.3)$$

Next, we define

$$\xi_2 = \frac{1}{\nu^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_1^2} + \frac{\mu_2^2}{w_2^2} \right) + 2 \ln(b_0).$$

Therefore, for a solution (x, θ_1, θ_2) of (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) &= -\frac{\theta_1}{w_1^2} + x\kappa_1 H + \mu_2 \left(-\frac{\theta_2}{w_2^2} + x\kappa_2 H \right) \\ &= -\left(\frac{\theta_1}{w_1^2} + \mu_2 \frac{\theta_2}{w_2^2} \right) + xH(\kappa_1 + \mu_2 \kappa_2) \\ &= -\left(\frac{\theta_1}{w_1^2} + \mu_2 \frac{\theta_2}{w_2^2} \right) + \nu \left(\ln(b_0) - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2w_1^2} - \frac{\theta_2^2}{2w_2^2} \right) \\ &= -\frac{\nu}{2w_1^2} \theta_1^2 - \frac{1}{w_1^2} \theta_1 - \frac{\nu}{2w_2^2} \theta_2^2 - \frac{\mu_2}{w_2^2} \theta_2 + \nu \ln(b_0). \\ &= -\frac{\nu}{2w_1^2} \left(\theta_1^2 + \frac{2}{\nu} \theta_1 \right) - \frac{\nu}{2w_2^2} \left(\theta_2^2 + \frac{2\mu_2}{\nu} \theta_2 \right) + \nu \ln(b_0). \\ &= -\frac{\nu}{2w_1^2} \left(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2 + \frac{\nu}{2w_1^2} \frac{1}{\nu^2} - \frac{\nu}{2w_2^2} \left(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu}{2w_2^2} \frac{\mu_2^2}{\nu^2} + \nu \ln(b_0). \\ &= -\frac{\nu}{2w_1^2} \left(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2 - \frac{\nu}{2w_2^2} \left(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2w_1^2 \nu} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2w_2^2 \nu} + \nu \ln(b_0). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the latter by $\frac{\nu}{2}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0 &\iff -\frac{1}{w_1^2} \left(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{w_2^2} \left(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{w_1^2 \nu^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu_2^2}{w_2^2 \nu^2} + 2 \ln(b_0) = 0. \\ &\iff \frac{1}{w_1^2} \left(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{w_2^2} \left(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right)^2 - \xi_2 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, if $\xi_2 < 0$, there is no solution to $g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0$.

If $\xi_2 = 0$, then

$$g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0 \iff (\theta_1, \theta_2) = \left(-\frac{1}{\nu}, -\frac{\mu_2}{\nu} \right).$$

If $\xi_2 > 0$, we let

$$a = w_1 \sqrt{\xi_2}, \quad b = w_2 \sqrt{\xi_2}.$$

It follows that

$$g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu_2 g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0 \iff \frac{(\theta_1 + \frac{1}{\nu})^2}{a^2} + \frac{(\theta_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{\nu})^2}{b^2} = 1.$$

That is, the ellipse centered at $(\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0) = (-\frac{1}{\nu}, -\frac{\mu_2}{\nu})$ with respective major and minor axis lengths a and b . Similarly to above, define

$$\xi_* = \frac{1}{\nu_*^2} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{w_1^2} + \frac{1}{w_2^2} \right) + 2 \ln(b_0), \quad \text{where } \nu_* = \mu_1 \kappa_1 + \kappa_2.$$

If $\xi_* > 0$, then

$$\mu_1 g_1(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) + g_2(x, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0 \iff \frac{(\theta_1 + \frac{\mu_1}{\nu_*})^2}{a_*^2} + \frac{(\theta_2 + \frac{1}{\nu_*})^2}{b_*^2} = 1.$$

That is, the ellipse centered at $(\theta_{1*}^0, \theta_{2*}^0) = (-\frac{\mu_1}{\nu_*}, -\frac{1}{\nu_*})$ with respective major and minor axis lengths

$$a_* = w_1 \sqrt{\xi_*}, \quad b_* = w_2 \sqrt{\xi_*}.$$

We observe that the two ellipses are the same:

1) They have the identical centers. Indeed, we have $\nu = \mu_2 \nu_*$ and $\frac{1}{\nu} = \frac{1}{\mu_2 \nu_*} = \frac{\mu_1}{\nu_*}$ since $\det(\Sigma) = 0$ implies that $\mu_1 \mu_2 = 1$. Likewise, we have $\frac{1}{\nu_*} = \frac{\mu_2}{\nu}$.

This proves that $(\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0) = (\theta_{1*}^0, \theta_{2*}^0)$, that is, the two centers are identical.

2) They have the same parameters. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\nu^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_1^2} + \frac{\mu_2^2}{w_2^2} \right) &= \frac{1}{\mu_2^2 \nu_*^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_1^2} + \frac{\mu_2^2}{w_2^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu_*^2} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_2^2 w_1^2} + \frac{1}{w_2^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu_*^2} \left(\frac{1}{w_2^2} + \frac{\mu_1^2}{w_1^2} \right), \quad \text{since } \mu_1 \mu_2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\xi_2 = \xi_*$ and thus $a = a_*$ and $b = b_*$.

To generalize, we note that $\Sigma g(x, \Theta) = 0$ implies that for given $1 \leq j \leq n$, we

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{ji} g_i(x, \Theta) = 0.$$

Since we assume that $\sigma_{ii} \neq 0$, without loss of generality, let $j = 1$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{ji} g_i(x, \Theta) = 0 \iff g_1(x, \Theta) + \mu_{12} g_2(x, \Theta) + \cdots + \mu_{1n} g_n(x, \Theta).$$

Rearranging the terms and completing the squares, we obtain the result as announced. \square