

Invariance of fixation probability in Moran-like Processes on graphs

Dr. Peter Keller*
Mert Uğurlu

Last update: March 20, 2024

Abstract

The now famous *Isothermal Theorem* was introduced in a Nature Communications article in 2005 by Nowak and Liebermann and has since been the founding document of the rich field of *evolutionary graph theory*.

Unfortunately, the Isothermal Theorem has never been proven completely. The main argument, that the projection of the graph dynamics is a Markovian Birth-and-Death-Process, is not applicable in general and leaves the question open for the case, when the projection is not Markov.

To complete the proof, we first generalise the model by Liebermann and Nowak, by introducing a non-uniform selection policy to select an individual for procreation. Then, we use a martingale argument to prove that selecting with a specific selection policy related to the weight matrix of the underlying population graph still gives rise to Moran fixation probability, even outside of the framework of the original Isothermal Theorem. Our proof includes and completes the proof of the Isothermal Theorem.

We follow up with a small numerical study that shows that the set of spatial Moran Processes with Moran fixation probability is even richer than previously understood. The initial condition and the selection policy play an important role in this.

Keywords: Spatial Moran Process, Markov Chains on Graphs, Martingales, Evolutionary Graph Theory

*Research Assistant at the University of Potsdam, mail: peter.keller-at-uni-potsdam.de




Figure 1: Illustration of the dynamics of the classic Moran Process for population size n .

1 Introduction

1.1 The classic Moran Process

In population genetics, the (classic) *Moran Process* is a fundamental stochastic process to understand genetic drift in finite, well mixed populations of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ individuals with overlapping generations and selection. It was introduced in 1958, see [Mor58]. The original individuals are called *wildtypes*. Initially, one or several *mutants* invade the population, and replace wildtypes, such that the the population size remains constant. After this initial invasion, no other mutants immigrate into the population.

Any of the individuals (wildtype or mutant) may be selected for procreation uniformly at random. Procreation is accepted with probability

$$\begin{cases} \frac{r}{r\frac{j}{n} + \frac{n-j}{n}} = \frac{r}{1+(r-1)\frac{j}{n}}, & \text{if a mutant is selected first,} \\ \frac{1}{r\frac{j}{n} + \frac{n-j}{n}} = \frac{1}{1+(r-1)\frac{j}{n}}. & \text{if a wildtype is selected first,} \end{cases}$$

where j is the number of mutants currently present in the population. The parameter $r > 0$ determines the fitness of the mutant population. For $0 < r < 1$, the procreation of mutants will be suppressed, for $r = 1$ the mutation is neutral (no preference of mutants over wildtype), and for $r > 1$, the procreation of mutants is amplified.

The Moran Process is a discrete, time-homogeneous Markov Chain $(M_k)_{k \geq 0}$ with states $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. It is a simple example of a Birth-and-Death-Process where the probabilities for birth and death are given by

$$p_{j,j+1} := \frac{r}{1+(r-1)\frac{j}{n}} \frac{j}{n} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right), \quad p_{j,j-1} := \frac{1}{1+(r-1)\frac{j}{n}} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) \frac{j}{n}, \quad (1)$$

where j is the current number of mutants in the population. The case, when the population has only one type left is expressed by $p_{0,1} = p_{n,n-1} = 0$ and $p_{0,0} = p_{n,n} = 1$, i.e. states 0 and n are absorbing. The graph in figure 1 illustrates the dynamics.

The event

$$T_{fix} := \inf\{k : M_k = n\},$$

where the population consists only of mutants for the first time, is called *fixation*. Since fixation is not certain, it is interesting to compute the fixation probability, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty | M_0 = i)$. A classic way to compute this is by first-step-analysis. We shortly repeat an alternative proof using martingales.

For $r = 1$, $p_{j,j+1} = p_{j,j-1}$. Thus, one finds that $(M_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale with respect to the canonical filtration $(\mathcal{F}_k)_k$, $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(M_0, M_1, \dots, M_k)$, and using Markov Property

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} | \mathcal{F}_k] &= M_k + \mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} - M_k | M_k] \\ &= M_k + (+1) \cdot p_{M_k, M_k+1} + (-1) \cdot p_{M_k, M_k-1} = M_k. \end{aligned}$$

The stopping time

$$T := \inf\{k : M_k \in \{0, n\}\}$$

is almost surely finite, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(T < \infty | M_0 = i) = 1$, for all $1 \leq i < n$. Applying the Optional Stopping Theorem, one gets

$$i = \mathbb{E}[M_0] = \mathbb{E}[M_T] = (1 - \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty)) \cdot 0 + \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty) \cdot n.$$

Rearranging gives

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty | M_0 = i) = \frac{i}{n}.$$

For $r \neq 1$, one notices that for every $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$

$$\frac{p_{j,j-1}}{p_{j,j+1}} = \frac{1}{r}.$$

Furthermore, the function $h(j) := 1/r^j$ is harmonic on the transient states $\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and thus $(r^{-M_k})_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale, too. The Optional Stopping Theorem then implies analogue to before

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty | M_0 = i) = \frac{1 - 1/r^i}{1 - 1/r^n}.$$

In the literature on *evolutionary graph theory*, see [LHN05; NOW06; DM21], the quantity

$$\varrho_i := \begin{cases} \frac{1 - 1/r^i}{1 - 1/r^n} & r \neq 1, \\ \frac{i}{n} & r = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

is referred to as *Moran fixation probability*. The main idea of evolutionary graph theory is to incorporate a structure into the population and compare under which population structures ϱ_i is still the fixation probability.

1.2 Extension of the Moran Process to structured populations

In the past, the classic Moran Process has been extended to take population structure into account, see [DM21] for a review on the history and recent research on the topic. The population structure is now modelled via a directed, weighted graph. The vertices of the graph can either be occupied by a mutant or a wildtype. Once an individual is chosen, only its direct neighbour can be replaced with a copy.

The global dynamics defines a Markov Chain, where the states are all possible marked graphs with respect to the original (unmarked) graph (details in section 2). Again, one can ask about the probability of fixation, i.e. the probability that eventually all vertices of the graph are occupied by mutants.

In [LHN05], the authors claim that under some conditions on the graph and the weights, this process has the same fixation probability ϱ_i as the Moran Process. This result is known in the literature as *Isothermal Theorem*. The proof uses a projection onto a simpler process $(M_k)_k$, which is not generally a Markov Chain (we choose the same notation as in the previous subsection for the classic Moran process, as this projection shares many properties with the original Moran Process). They then use results from Birth-and-Death-Processes for the computation of the fixation probability. This method fails, as the projection of a Markov Chain is not necessarily Markov, unless under lumpability, see [MR17; Buc94; KS76] for extensive analysis of the different forms of lumpability. This shortcoming has not been noticed so far in the literature, not even in the recent review paper [DM21]. Therefore, the isothermal theorem remains unproven till today.




Figure 2: General setup of the Microscopic Spatial Moran Process (MicSPM) exemplary for $n = 3$. We omit the vertices and transition probabilities, and show only occupation by 0s or 1s. The underlying graph is the complete graph K_3 . Whether or not all drawn vertices exist, depends on the choice for the weights given by weight matrix W .

We first generalise the model, by allowing a non-uniform selection policy for the choice of the next individual to procreate. Then, with an analogue approach as for the classic Moran Process above, we construct a martingale $(r^{-M_k})_k$, that regardless of the non-Markovianity of $(M_k)_k$ delivers Moran fixation probability by Optional Stopping Theorem. The Isothermal Theorem by Liebermann follows as a simple corollary.

1.3 Organisation of the paper

In Section 2 we introduce the spatial Moran Process, extending previous definitions such that selection of individuals for procreation is not necessarily uniform, but stationary with respect to the weights of the graph. We state the Isothermal Theorem and then give explicit expressions for the probability to increase/decrease the mutant population in matrix notation. In section 3, we prove that our spatial Moran Process shows the same fixation probability as the simple, one-dimensional classic Moran Process, independent of the initial condition. Section 4 explores numerically all possible choices of parameters to retain Moran fixation in the simple case of $n = 2$.

2 The spatial Moran Model

2.1 Population structure

To model the structure of a population, let $G = (E, V)$ be a directed graph, where the set of vertices is $V := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let the edge weight be a function $W : E \times E \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The weight function determines the set of edges of the graph. If $W(v, v') > 0$, then vertex v is connected with vertex v' , and $(v, v') \in E$.

W can be represented as a $n \times n$ matrix $(w_{vv'})_{v,v' \in V}$, where $w_{vv'} := W(v, v')$. This implies, that $W(v, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on the direct neighbours of v (including v).

Let further be $\mathbf{1} := (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and “ x^\top ” denote transposition of a row vector x or a matrix.

We further assume that G is strongly connected, i.e. for every two distinct vertices $v, v' \in V$, there is a finite sequence of strictly positively weighted edges connecting v with v' and vice versa. Therefore, there exists a unique, strictly positive left-eigenvalue $\pi := (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n)$ that fulfils

$$\pi W = \pi, \quad \pi \mathbf{1}^\top = 1. \quad (3)$$

Due to the normalisation, we can think of π as a probability distribution on the vertices of G . Note, that in the following, we do not think of W as the transition matrix of a random dynamics.

Given the graph, we want to mark a vertex with either 0 for a wildtype, or with 1 for a mutant. Let the collection of all possible markings of G with 0's and 1's be $\mathcal{X} := \{0, 1\}^V$. An element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is called *graph configuration* or just configuration. Obviously, there are 2^n such configurations in \mathcal{X} . We decompose \mathcal{X} into the *canonical decomposition*

$$\mathcal{X} = \bigsqcup_{\ell=0}^n \mathcal{X}_\ell,$$

where \mathcal{X}_ℓ contains all configurations with exactly ℓ mutants resp. 1's.

Given the graph structure and a fixed numbering of the vertices, we can represent any graph configuration $x \in \mathcal{X}$ by a row vector $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of zeros and ones, i.e. we set the j^{th} component of x to zero resp. one, if vertex j is occupied by a wildtype resp. mutant. For convenience, we will use x for both the configuration as well as the vector representation. Analogue, we will use \mathcal{X} in both interpretations interchangeably.

2.2 Dynamics of the spatial Moran Process

We introduce two stochastic processes, to describe the development of the population. One describes the dynamics on the marked graph G , as described in the previous subsection, in a *microscopic* fashion. The other is the projection onto the canonical decomposition \mathcal{X} , that has similarities to the classic Moran Process, but does not constitute a Markov Chain in general.

Definition 2.1 (Microscopic Spatial Moran Process)

Let G be a directed, strongly connected graph with weight matrix W and let π be its unique strictly positive left-eigenvector, with $\pi W = \pi$. Let $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be a positive constant (called *mutant fitness*). Let $(X_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a Markov Chain with state space \mathcal{X} on the filtrated probability space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F} := (\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(X_0, \dots, X_k)$ is the canonical filtration.

For $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote with $\zeta = x\pi^\top$, the probability to select a vertex with mark 1 under *selection policy* π . The dynamics of $(X_k)_k$ is given by the following update rule:

- X_0 is chosen according to the initial probability distribution α
- At time $k > 0$,
 - a vertex v is selected for procreation under selection policy π , i.e. the probability to choose v is π_v .
 - Independently, another vertex v' is chosen randomly according to the probability measure $W(v, \cdot)$.

- Procreation of v and replacement of v' with a copy of the same type as v is accepted according to mutant fitness r with probability

$$\begin{cases} \frac{r}{1+(r-1)\zeta_k} & \text{if } v \text{ is marked 1 (mutant),} \\ \frac{1}{1+(r-1)\zeta_k} & \text{if } v \text{ is marked 0 (wildtype).} \end{cases}$$

Each update is independent of the previous one, resp. depends only on the last configuration. This defines a Glauber-dynamics, which implies that $(X_k)_k$ is a Markov Chain.

The configurations, where all vertices are occupied by the same type, are absorbing. Let further be

$$T_{fix} := \inf\{k \geq 0 : X_k = \mathbb{1}\} \quad (4)$$

the \mathcal{F} -stopping time, when $(X_k)_k$ reaches fixation for the first time, i.e. when all vertices of G are marked 1 resp. all vertices are occupied by mutants. T_{fix} is called *fixation time*. We denote the probability that fixation is reached under initial distribution α with

$$\rho_\alpha := \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < +\infty \mid X_0 \sim \alpha). \quad (5)$$

If $\alpha(\mathcal{X}_i) = 1$, we write ρ_i .

We call

$$\langle G, W, \pi, (X_k)_{k \geq 0}, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$$

the *Microscopic Spatial Moran Process* (MicSMP) on G .

To coarsen the process, we just count the number of mutants currently present in the population (similar to the classic Moran Process). This is equivalent to projecting the Markov Chain $(X_k)_k$ onto the canonical decomposition.

Definition 2.2 (Macroscopic Spatial Moran Process)

Let $\langle G, W, \pi, (X_k)_k, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$ be a given micSMP. The *projection* $(M_k)_k$ onto the canonical decomposition of G defined by

$$M_k := X_k \mathbb{1}^\top$$

is called *Macroscopic Spatial Moran Process* (macSMP).

Figure 2 shows an example of the model for $n = 3$.

Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_k)_k$ be the canonical filtration with $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k)$ and note that $M_k = X_k \mathbb{1}^\top$ is a \mathcal{F} -measurable, bounded function of X_k , since $0 \leq M_k \leq n$ a.s. Thus by Markov Property

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} \mid X_k],$$

i.e. the number of mutants M_{k+1} depends only on the last visited graph configuration X_k , but it does *not* follow that $(M_k)_k$ is a Markov Chain in general, i.e. usually

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \neq \mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} \mid M_k].$$

2.3 The Isothermal Theorem

In [LHN05], the authors define the *isothermal property* in the following way: If for all v, v'

$$\sum_{v \in V} w_{vv'} = \sum_{v' \in V} w_{vv'},$$

then W is called isothermal. The isothermal property indeed just says that for any vertex of the graph the sum of incoming weights is equal to the sum of outgoing weights. In matrix notation, this is just

$$W\mathbf{1}^\top = W^\top\mathbf{1}^\top = \mathbf{1}.$$

The last equality holds because of the assumed stochasticity of W . From this, it follows, that W is isothermal if and only if W is bistochastic, and the invariant measure of W , fulfilling $\pi W = \pi$, must be uniform.

Theorem 2.1 (Isothermal Theorem, [LHN05]) _____

Let $\langle G, W, \pi, (X_k)_k, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$ be a micSMP with W bistochastic and $\pi = n^{-1}\mathbf{1}$, then for all i , $1 \leq i < n$, and any α with $\alpha(X_0) = i$, holds

$$\rho_i = \varrho_i.$$

In other words, if the weight matrix of the micSMP is bistochastic and the selection policy is uniform, then under any starting number of mutants i , the fixation probability of the micSMP will be the Moran fixation probability.

We skip the proof of Theorem 2.1, as it is a special case of Theorem 3.1.

2.4 Probability to increase/decrease the mutant population

The probability to increase the mutant population by one, given a configuration X_k , can be expressed in matrix notation. We write $p_{+|X_k}$ for the (total) probability of increasing the mutant population by one starting with configuration $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $p_{-|x}$ for the (total) probability to decrease the mutant population by one. These probabilities are transitions from a specific $x \in \mathcal{X}_j$ into the set $\mathcal{X}_{j\pm 1}$. Let $\langle G, W, \pi, (X_k)_k, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$ be a micSMP.

Let $W_\pi := \text{diag}(\pi)W$ and $\zeta_k = X_k\pi^\top$, then by stochasticity of W

$$X_k W_\pi \mathbf{1}^\top = X_k \text{diag}(\pi) \mathbf{1}^\top = X_k \pi^\top = \zeta_k.$$

Thus

$$p_{+|X_k} := \frac{r}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} X_k W_\pi (\mathbf{1} - X_k)^\top = \frac{r}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (\zeta_k - X_k W_\pi X_k^\top). \quad (6)$$

Similarly, we compute the probability to decrease the mutant population by one

$$p_{-|X_k} := \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (\mathbf{1} - X_k) W_\pi X_k^\top = \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (\zeta_k - X_k W_\pi X_k^\top). \quad (7)$$

The probability not to change the size of the mutant population is $p_{0|X_k} := 1 - p_{+|X_k} - p_{-|X_k}$. Consequently, the macSMP $(M_k)_k$ behaves very similar to a birth-and-death-process, but the transition probabilities are random resp. dependent on the last visited configuration explicitly through $X_k W_\pi X_k$.

Comparison with the classic Moran Process

We may note, that the spatial model introduced above is fully compatible with the classic Moran Process. The population structure of the classic Moran Process can be thought of as the complete graph with loops on n vertices. The weight of each edge is $1/n$ to reflect that any individual is neighbour to any other individual. If we thus choose $W = n^{-1}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathbf{1}$, then the stationary distribution π of W is uniform, i.e. $\pi = (n)^{-1}\mathbf{1}$ and the probability to select a

mutant is $\zeta_k = X_k \pi^\top = M_k/n$, where M_k is the number of mutants currently present in the population. Furthermore,

$$X_k \text{diag}(\pi) W X_k^\top = X_k \pi^\top \frac{1}{n} (X_k \mathbf{1}^\top)^\top = \zeta_k^2 = \left(\frac{M_k}{n}\right)^2.$$

Therefore, the increase/decrease probabilities do no longer depend on X_k explicitly, but on M_k , the number of mutants currently present:

$$p_{+|X_k} = \frac{r}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} \zeta_k (1 - \zeta_k), \quad p_{-|X_k} = \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (1 - \zeta_k) \zeta_k.$$

That means, in this special case, the macSMP is isomorph to the classic Moran Process, see also (1).

Please note, that this does not hold true, when we use a non-uniform selection policy, especially if it is also dependent on the initial distribution, compare section 4.

3 The stationary selection theorem

The aim of this section is to show that selecting individuals via the stationary distribution of the stochastic weight matrix W is the natural choice to retain Moran fixation probability. In the previous section, we gained expressions of the increase/decrease probabilities. The main observation for the proof of the Theorem below, is that for all configurations $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{\mathcal{X}_0 \cup \mathcal{X}_n\}$

$$\frac{p_{-|x}}{p_{+|x}} = \frac{1}{r}, \tag{8}$$

compare (6-7). This property is analogue to the observation that we made in the introduction regarding the classic Moran Model. Again, we use this property to construct a martingale.

Theorem 3.1 (Stationary selection Theorem)

Let $\langle G, W, \pi, (X_k)_{k \geq 0}, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$ be a microscopic Spatial Moran Process.

Then, for any initial distribution α with $\alpha(\mathcal{X}_i) = 1$ and any i with $0 < i < n$, we have

$$\rho_i = \varrho_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1-1/r^i}{1-1/r^n} & r \neq 1, \\ \frac{i}{n} & r = 1 \end{cases},$$

i.e. the microscopic Spatial Moran Process has the same fixation probability as the classic Moran Process independent of the initial distribution, if the selection policy is stationary with respect to W .

Proof. We first note that $0 \leq |M_k| \leq n$, for all k , such that $(M_k)_k$ is integrable. Define

$$\Delta_k := M_{k+1} - M_k.$$

By construction, $\Delta_k(\omega) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. We get by the Markov Property

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | X_k] = p_{+|X_k} - p_{-|X_k} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (X_k (rW_\pi - W_\pi^\top) \mathbf{1}^\top + (r-1)X_k W_\pi X_k^\top). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We have further

$$\begin{aligned} X_k (rW_\pi - W_\pi^\top) \mathbf{1}^\top &= X_k (r \text{diag}(\pi) W \mathbf{1}^\top - (\pi W)^\top) \\ &= X_k (r\pi^\top - \pi^\top) = (r-1)X_k \pi^\top = (r-1)\zeta_k. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | X_k] = \frac{r-1}{1+(r-1)\zeta_k} (\zeta_k - X_k W_\pi X_k^\top). \quad (11)$$

If $r = 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | X_k] = 0$. Therefore $(M_k)_k$ is a \mathcal{F} -martingale, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{k+1} | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k + M_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = M_k. \quad (12)$$

Define the \mathcal{F} -stopping time

$$T := \inf\{k \geq 0 : M_k \in \{0, n\}\}. \quad (13)$$

Since T is the absorption time in a finite Markov Chain, where all transitive states communicate with positive probability, $\mathbb{E}[T] < \infty$, a.s. Now, we can apply the Optional Stopping Theorem, and get $i = \mathbb{E}[M_0] = \mathbb{E}[M_T]$. This implies

$$i = \mathbb{E}[M_T] = \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty) \cdot n + (1 - \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty)) \cdot 0 = \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty) \cdot n, \quad (14)$$

and thus $\mathbb{P}(T_{fix} \leq \infty | X_0 \in \mathcal{X}_i \text{ a.s.}) = \frac{i}{n}$.

For $r \neq 1$ define

$$N_k := r^{-M_k}, \quad (15)$$

where $N_0 = r^{-i}$ a.s. Again, $(N_k)_k$ is \mathcal{F} -adapted and bounded since M_k is bounded, and thus integrable. The process $(N_k)_k$ is indeed a \mathcal{F} -martingale

$$\mathbb{E}[r^{-M_{k+1}} | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E}[r^{-M_k} r^{-\Delta_k} | \mathcal{F}_k] = r^{-M_k} \mathbb{E}[r^{-\Delta_k} | X_k] \quad (16)$$

$$= r^{-M_k} \left(r^{-1} p_{-|X_k}^\pi + r^0 (1 - p_{-|X_k}^\pi - p_{+|X_k}^\pi) + r^1 p_{+|X_k}^\pi \right) = r^{-M_k}, \quad (17)$$

i.e. $\mathbb{E}[N_{k+1} | \mathcal{F}_k] = N_k$. Applying the Optional Stopping Theorem for T and $(N_k)_k$ delivers

$$r^{-i} = \mathbb{E}[N_0] = \mathbb{E}[N_T] = r^0 (1 - \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty)) + r^{-n} \mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty). \quad (18)$$

Rearranging gives

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{fix} < \infty | X_0 \in \mathcal{X}_i \text{ a.s.}) = \frac{1 - 1/r^i}{1 - 1/r^n}, \quad (19)$$

as desired. \square

Remark 1 ()

The Isothermal Theorem 2.1 follows from Theorem 3.1, immediately.

3.1 A remark on the choice of selection policy

Instead of choosing the next individual with the stationary probability distribution π , we can also choose with any probability distribution μ on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In light of Theorem 3.1, we loose the constancy of the ratio of increase and decrease probability.

Theorem 3.2 ()

In a micSMP $\langle G, W, \mu, (X_k)_k, \alpha, r, \rho_\alpha \rangle$ with arbitrary selection policy μ , we have

$$p_{+|X_k}^\mu = \frac{r}{1+(r-1)\zeta_k} (X_k W_\mu \mathbf{1}^\top - X_k W_\mu X_k^\top),$$

$$p_{-|X_k}^\mu = \frac{1}{1+(r-1)\zeta_k} (X_k W_\mu^\top \mathbf{1}^\top - X_k W_\mu X_k).$$

Further, we have

$$\frac{p_{-|X_k}}{p_{+|X_k}} = \frac{1}{r}$$

if and only if $\mu = \pi$, where $\pi W = \pi$.

Proof. Replacing π in (6-7) with μ , we get for the increase and decrease probabilities (adapting $\zeta_k = X_k \mu^\top$)

$$p_{+|X_k}^\mu = \frac{r}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} X_k W_\mu (\mathbf{1} - X_k)^\top = \frac{r}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (X_k W_\mu \mathbf{1}^\top - X_k W_\mu X_k^\top),$$

$$p_{-|X_k}^\mu = \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (\mathbf{1} - X_k) W_\mu X_k^\top = \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)\zeta_k} (X_k W_\mu^\top \mathbf{1}^\top - X_k W_\mu X_k).$$

Note, that with arbitrary selection policy μ , we still have $X_k W_\mu \mathbf{1}^\top = \zeta_k$ in $p_{+|X_k}$. But since μ is no longer stationary, we can not simplify $X_k W_\mu^\top \mathbf{1}^\top$ in the same way in $p_{-|X_k}$.

Now, for arbitrary selection policy μ the ratio of decrease and increase probability can be expressed as

$$\frac{p_{-|X_k}^\mu}{p_{+|X_k}^\mu} = \frac{1}{r} \left(1 + \frac{X_k (W_\mu - W_\mu^\top) \mathbf{1}^\top}{X_k W_\mu (\mathbf{1} - X_k)^\top} \right). \quad (20)$$

This expression, independent of X_k , is constant over all graph configurations, if and only if

$$(W_\mu - W_\mu^\top) \mathbf{1}^\top = 0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$0 = \text{diag}(\mu) W \mathbf{1}^\top - W^\top \text{diag}(\mu) \mathbf{1}^\top = \mu^\top - W^\top \mu^\top,$$

and thus becomes the condition $\mu W = \mu$ for stationarity. This implies that the only choice for μ is the stationary distribution of W to make (20) constant. \square

Unfortunately, Theorem 3.2 does not exhaust all the choices of initial condition and selection policies to have Moran fixation probability ϱ_i in a micSMP, see next section.

4 Numerical study for population size $n = 2$

Theorem 3.1 gives sufficient assumptions for a micSMP to have Moran fixation, but it does say nothing about the necessity. To understand this at least for small population size, we compute the fixation probability of a population with two individuals explicitly and try to find all solutions with Moran fixation depending on the parameters of weight matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - w_1 & w_1 \\ w_2 & 1 - w_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $w_1, w_2 \in (0, 1)$, initial condition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, 1 - \alpha_1)$, fitness parameter r and selection policy $\mu = (\mu_1, 1 - \mu_1)$, which is not necessarily stationary with respect to W .

The transition matrix of the micSMP on its state space $\{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ is

	(0,0)	(0,1)	(1,0)	(1,1)
(0,0)	1	0	0	0
(0,1)	$\frac{\mu_1 w_1}{1 + (r-1)(1-\mu_1)}$	$1 - \frac{\mu_1 w_1 + r(1-\mu_1)w_2}{1 + (r-1)(1-\mu_1)}$	0	$\frac{r(1-\mu_1)w_2}{1 + (r-1)(1-\mu_1)}$
(1,0)	$\frac{(1-\mu_1)w_2}{1 + (r-1)\mu_1}$	0	$1 - \frac{(1-\mu_1)w_2 + r\mu_1 w_1}{1 + (r-1)\mu_1}$	$\frac{r\mu_1 w_1}{1 + (r-1)\mu_1}$
(1,1)	0	0	0	1

Then, by usual phase-type distribution calculus,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\alpha &= (\alpha_1, 1 - \alpha_1) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\mu_1 w_1 + r(1 - \mu_1)w_2}{1 + (r-1)(1 - \mu_1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{(1 - \mu_1)w_2 + r\mu_1 w_1}{1 + (r-1)\mu_1} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{r(1 - \mu_1)w_2}{1 + (r-1)(1 - \mu_1)} \\ \frac{r\mu_1 w_1}{1 + (r-1)\mu_1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= r\alpha_1(1 - \mu_1) \frac{1}{\mu_1 \frac{w_1}{w_2} + r(1 - \mu_1)} + r(1 - \alpha_1)\mu_1 \frac{1}{(1 - \mu_1) \frac{w_2}{w_1} + r\mu_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We already know by Theorem 3.1, that using the stationary distribution

$$\mu = \pi = \left(\frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}, \frac{w_1}{w_1 + w_2} \right)$$

of W as selection policy is sufficient for $\rho_\alpha = \varrho_1$.

We explore the parameter space of all solutions to $\rho_\alpha = \varrho_1 = \frac{r}{r+1}$ for the special case when $w_1 = w_2 = w \in (0, 1)$ (isothermal case). Then, the fixation probability (21) does no longer depend on w . We have $\rho_\alpha = \varrho_1$ if and only if

$$\frac{1 - 1/r}{1 - 1/r^2} = \frac{r}{r + 1} = r\alpha_1 \frac{(1 - \mu_1)}{\mu_1 + r(1 - \mu_1)} + r(1 - \alpha_1) \frac{\mu_1}{(1 - \mu_1) + r\mu_1}. \quad (22)$$

From this, we get the following solutions.

- $\mu_1 = 1/2$ and arbitrary α_1 , as $\pi = (1/2, 1/2)$ is now the stationary distribution.
- If $r = 1$, (22) becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} = \alpha_1(1 - \mu_1) + (1 - \alpha_1)\mu_1, \quad (23)$$

which has solution $\alpha_1 = 1/2$ and μ_1 arbitrary, or $\mu = 1/2$ and α_1 arbitrary.

- For $r \neq 1$, we get another solution, where initial distribution and selection policy depend linearly on each other

$$\mu_1 = \frac{r}{r - 1} - \alpha_1 \frac{r + 1}{r - 1}.$$

We show the solutions for $r = 2$ in figure 3.

5 Summary

The microscopic Spatial Moran Process plays a pivotal role in *evolutionary graph theory*, see [NOW06]. The argument from [LHN05] based on the assumption that $(M_k)_k$ is a Markovian Birth-and-Death-Process, but this is not generally the case, as is clearly visible in (6) and (7).

We have closed the gap in the proof of Liebermann and Nowak, and showed that a much larger range of models with generalised (stationary) selection of individuals also retains Moran fixation probability, independently of initial condition. We may thus interpret Moran fixation, as a consequence of selecting stationary with respect to the population structure, instead of just uniformly over all individuals of the population.

Our numerical study for the trivial case of two individuals also hints at another class of models with Moran fixation that depend on the initial distribution and also on the selection policy. Indeed, even in the case of isothermality where both individuals behave indistinguishable, we find more solutions than previously known. We conjecture, that it is always possible to choose initial condition and selection policy such that Moran fixation occurs. If independence of the initial distribution is required, we conjecture, that Theorem 3.1 exhausts this class completely.




Figure 3: Set of fixation probability for $r = 2$. Dashed lines indicate all pairs (α_1, μ_1) that imply Moran fixation. The solution $\mu_1 = 1/2$ and α_1 arbitrary is the set of solutions from Theorem 3.1. Colours from orange to violet indicate fixation probability lower than Moran fixation, colours from orange to yellow indicate solutions with higher fixation probability than Moran.

6 Acknowledgements

We thank Prof. Dr. Andrey Pilipenko and Prof. Dr. Rœlly for fruitful discussions.

References

- [Buc94] P. Buchholz. “Exact and Ordinary Lumpability in Finite Markov Chains”. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 31.1 (1994), pp. 59–75.
- [DM21] J. Díaz and D. Mitsche. “A survey of the modified Moran process and evolutionary graph theory”. In: *Computer Science Review* 39 (2021), p. 100347. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2020.100347>.
- [KS76] J. G. Kemeny and J. L. Snell. *Finite Markov chains*. Reprint of the 1960 edition. Springer, 1976.
- [LHN05] E. Lieberman, C. Hauert, and M. A. Nowak. “Evolutionary dynamics on graphs”. In: *Nature* 433.7023 (2005), pp. 312–316. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: [10.1038/nature03204](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03204).
- [MR17] A. Marin and S. Rossi. “On the relations between Markov chain lumpability and reversibility”. In: *Acta Informatica* 54.5 (2017), pp. 447–485. DOI: [10.1007/s00236-016-0266-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-016-0266-1). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-016-0266-1>.
- [Mor58] P. A. P. Moran. “Random processes in genetics”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 54 (1958), pp. 60–71.
- [NOW06] M. A. NOWAK. *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life*. Harvard University Press, 2006. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvjghw98>.