

# A GENERALIZED MODEL OF MUTATION-SELECTION BALANCE WITH APPLICATIONS TO AGING

DAVID STEINSALTZ<sup>+</sup>, STEVEN N. EVANS, AND KENNETH W. WACHTER

**ABSTRACT.** A probability model is presented for the dynamics of mutation-selection balance in a haploid infinite-population infinite-sites setting sufficiently general to cover mutation-driven changes in full age-specific demographic schedules. The model accommodates epistatic as well as additive selective costs. Closed form characterizations are obtained for solutions in finite time, along with proofs of convergence to stationary distributions and a proof of the uniqueness of solutions in a restricted case. Examples are given of applications to the biodemography of aging, including instabilities in current formulations of mutation accumulation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Heuristic arguments from the mathematical genetics of mutation-selection balance figure broadly in evolutionary theories of senescence. But existing formal models do not cover the cases brought to the fore by recent progress in biodemography [1]. In this paper, we present a rigorous general model covering these cases, prove results concerning existence, uniqueness, and convergence, obtain closed-form representations for solutions to the model, and give examples of its application to questions in the demography of aging.

The whole mathematical theory of natural selection may be divided into three parts: positive mutations, neutral mutations, and deleterious mutations. Positive mutations may be thought to add up to an optimal adaptation, regardless of the details of the mutation and selection processes, and are generally studied in that context. Neutral mutations have their primary effects in alleles which drift randomly to fixation. Deleterious mutations, the focal subject for theories of aging and for this paper, are expected never to achieve fixation in populations, except, through founder effects, in very small populations. Their influence in large populations derives from their persistent reintroduction and slow meander to extinction.

Sir Peter Medawar [2], in 1952, saw an explanation for senescence in the accumulation of deleterious alleles with age-specific effects, given the declining force of

---

<sup>+</sup> To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Demography, University of California, 2232 Piedmont Avenue, Berkeley, CA. 94720-2120; email dstein@demog.berkeley.edu.

natural selection with adult age. W. D. Hamilton [3], gave a way of quantifying this declining age-specific force, and the resulting balance between mutation and selection. B. Charlesworth [4] developed a systematic formulation which guides many current experiments. A mutation theory of longevity must address the cumulative effects of large numbers of small mutations. Two-allele or n-allele models are suggestive but not directly applicable. In these theories, the genotypes determine full age-specific schedules of mortality and fertility, and the effects of a mutation have to be represented by a whole function of age. A rigorous treatment demands that mutations correspond to points in abstract spaces such as function spaces, with consequent complexities of topology and abstract probability.

Up to now, theorists have side-stepped complexities by relying on linear approximations to cost functions and restricting their representations of mutations to stylized patterns like step-functions. Intriguing results have been obtained, including recent results by Charlesworth discussed in Section 5. The linear analysis, however, can be deceptive, as we shall show, and the stylized patterns are remote from realistic models of gene action. Cases chosen for analytic tractability give a misleading picture of the full range of possibilities.

Our model is an infinite-population model in continuous time. The dynamical equation is a fairly standard one, but the space of mathematical objects to which it applies is novel. Our model allows a highly flexible specification of pleiotropic gene action. It is especially suited to demographic applications with mutations affecting age-specific schedules. In some other respects, the treatment of the genome is rudimentary. The model is a haploid infinite-population model. All mutant alleles are assumed to segregate independently. Our contribution is to allow large numbers of genes to make small contributions to a continuum of linked traits. Traditional analyses which recognize individual alleles (thus admitting, in principle, arbitrary configurations of pleiotropy) are amenable only to small numbers of loci; quantitative genetics, which reduces the contributions of individual genes to a continuum, reduces the complexity of pleiotropy to covariance matrices.

Unlike other models of which we are aware, our model comfortably accommodates epistasis. The selective cost of a mutation can depend on the configuration of other mutations present in a genome. This property is critical to the study of senescence, even without special assumptions about interactions among genes, because the fitness costs of cumulative demographic changes are not linear.

We are able to obtain closed-form representations of the entire time path of solutions to our dynamical equation. Our results are not restricted, like most previous work, to limiting states and equilibrium distributions. We give proofs of

convergence over time, obtain rates of convergence, and so put in place machinery for handling changing as well as static fitness conditions. We have a proof of uniqueness for the solutions in the non-epistatic case but not as yet in the epistatic case.

## 2. PRIOR WORK

Charlesworth [4] is a standard source for mutation-selection models and Bürger [5] reviews recent developments. Durrett [6] shows that a discrete-time Markov-chain version with stepwise mutations of identical deleterious effect has a Poisson stationary distribution. The Poisson limit is implicit, as well, in estimations of equilibrium genetic variance [7]. The so-called HC-approximation, dating back to the 1980s [8], is also a limit distribution. It derives from a model of stabilizing selection around an intermediate optimum, and so differs from mutation-selection balance on deleterious traits.

Bürger’s “general mutation-selection model” [9, chapter IV.2] is the model warranting closest comparison with our own. Like us, Bürger draws mutations from a general space, according to an arbitrary distribution. Bürger requires his space to be locally compact, whereas we allow any complete, separable metric space, so enabling us to treat mutations identified with continuous functions on  $[0, \infty)$ .

More substantively, Bürger’s model and ours differ in their view of the genome. Bürger focuses on a single locus, with (perhaps) infinitely many potential alleles. Each individual’s genotype is characterized by a single quantity and the population is characterized by a distribution on the mutation space. We take a more synoptic view, watching the (perhaps) infinitely many alleles pop up at (perhaps) infinitely many loci. We thereby gain a more versatile representation of population heterogeneity. In our model, the only mutation process is the conversion of an undifferentiated wild type to a random mutant allele, so we need not introduce transition rates between alleles. However, our flexible treatment of heterogeneity means that even the description of the state of the system has to be more abstract than is customary in population genetics.

In a different setting, Del Moral and Miclo [10] present results which parallel our Theorem 1. Their conditions are more general in some respects and more restrictive in others. While their concerns are remote from biology, they use the terminology of “mutation generators” and “adaptation” in their descriptions. They prove that the differential equation model which we analyze can be derived as an infinite-population limit of finite nondeterministic Moran models for interacting particles.

## 3. THE MODEL

We consider an infinite population subject to mutation and selection. There is a complete, separable metric space of mutations  $\mathcal{M}$ , on which is defined a boundedly finite Borel measure  $\nu$ . (That is,  $\nu$  assigns finite mass to bounded sets; together with the assumptions on  $\mathcal{M}$ , this implies that  $\nu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.) We refer to this measure as the “mutation rate”; for any set  $B$ , the quantity  $\nu(B)$  represents the rate at which there spontaneously arises a mutation from  $B$ .

The space of “genotypes”  $\mathcal{G}$  is identified with the integer-valued boundedly finite Borel measures on  $\mathcal{M}$ , with a topology to be described shortly. An element of  $\mathcal{G}$  has the form  $\sum \delta_{m_i}$ , where the  $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$  are not necessarily distinct and the number of  $m_i$  in any bounded subset of  $\mathcal{M}$  is finite. Each genotype represents a set of mutations that an individual may carry.

The state of the population at time  $t$  is denoted  $P_t$ , which is a Borel probability measure on the measures in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Thus  $P_t$  is the distribution of a random measure [11, 12]. The evolution of the population is presumed to be so slow that it can be represented as occurring in continuous time, without reference to discrete generations.

To each genotype  $g$  we assign a “selection cost”  $S(g)$ .  $S$  is a continuous function from  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . (Including negative costs would be feasible for the finite-time solutions, at the cost of slightly more complicated theorem statements.) We normalize costs so that  $S$  vanishes on the null genotype, the genotype with no mutations, and vanishes for no other  $g$ . On  $\mathcal{M}$  we write  $S(m)$  for the cost of the singleton  $g = \delta_m$ . When  $S$  is linear, so that  $S(g + \delta_m) - S(g)$  is independent of  $g$ , the model is additive, or *nonepistatic*.

Any measure  $P$  on  $\mathcal{G}$ , like  $P_t$ , may be determined by the expectation values it assigns to a suitably rich collection of functions  $F$  from  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , as specified below. For brevity, we write  $PF$  or  $P(F)$  for the expectation value  $PF = \int_{\mathcal{G}} F(g) dP(g)$  of any measurable function from  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int |F(g)| dP(g) < \infty$ . Since genotypes are measures, we can also write  $gf = g(f) = \int f(m) dg(m) = \sum f(m_i)$  when  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $g = \sum \delta_{m_i}$ .

Our dynamic equation for  $P_t$  is

$$(1) \quad \frac{d}{dt} P_t F = P_t \left( \int [F(\cdot + \delta_m) - F(\cdot)] d\nu(m) \right) - P_t(FS) + (P_t F)(P_t S)$$

The meaning of the equation is readily described when  $F$  is the indicator function of a set  $B$  of genotypes. The first term inside the integral measures the rate at which the population is flowing into the states in  $B$  out of all sorts of other states because of the addition of a mutation  $m$  that lines up just right to enter  $B$ . The second term

inside the integral measures the rate at which population flows out of  $B$  because of a new mutation. The remaining two terms measure the effect of selection. The proportional rate of change in mass of the population in  $B$  equals the difference between the average fitness cost of genotypes in  $B$  and the average fitness cost of the whole population.

Measuring fitness relative to the changing average fitness of the whole population keeps total mass constant and lets the measure  $P_t$  represent the probability of finding a randomly selected individual in a given state, modeling population distribution rather than population size. While our equation may be novel, it is strongly analogous to standard mutation-selection dynamics on quantitative traits, such as those given in equation V.2.11 of [9].

When mutations are identical (so that  $\mathcal{M}$  comprises only a single point) we have a “mutation-counting model”. We can specify a genotype by a natural number, and (1) becomes

$$(2) \quad \frac{dP_t(n)}{dt} = \nu P_t(n-1) - \nu P_t(n) - P_t(n) \left( S(n) - \sum_m S(m) P_t(m) \right)$$

In the non-epistatic case, where  $S$  is additive, it has been pointed out, most recently by Durrett [6], that a discrete-time analogue of the mutation-counting model has a Poisson distribution with parameter  $\nu/S(1)$  as stationary distribution. So far as we know, neither uniqueness nor convergence to this stationary distribution has previously been established.

For general  $\mathcal{G}$ , the counterpart of the Poisson distribution is a Poisson random measure. For the non-epistatic case, Theorem 3 establishes conditions for uniqueness and convergence to a stationary distribution given by a Poisson random measure with intensity  $(1/S(m))d\nu(m)$ , the measure on  $\mathcal{M}$  whose Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to  $\nu$  is  $1/S$ . (A Poisson random measure assigns a Poisson-distributed, random integer mass to each measurable set, the mean of the mass assigned to a set is the intensity measure of the set, and the random masses of disjoint sets are independent random variables.) These are complicated objects, but the general theory [12, Chapter 7] takes care of technical details. Even in the non-epistatic case, only rather special starting states lead to the Poisson limit. For the epistatic case, covered by Theorem 1, asymptotic distributions, when they exist, need not be Poisson.

We need a suitable notion of weak convergence for boundedly finite random measures. Following Appendix A.2 of [12], we equip the space  $\mathcal{G}$  with the metrizable  $\hat{w}$ -topology under which a sequence of measures  $g_1, g_2, \dots \in \mathcal{G}$  converges to a measure  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $\lim_n g_n(f) = g(f)$  for each bounded continuous

function  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is supported on a bounded set. A sequence of probability measures  $Q_1, Q_2, \dots$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  (that is, a sequence of distributions of boundedly finite random measures on  $\mathcal{M}$ ) converges weakly to the probability measure  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to the  $\hat{w}$ -topology if and only if  $\lim_n Q_n(F) = Q(F)$  for every bounded  $\hat{w}$ -continuous function  $F$  on  $\mathcal{G}$ . This turns out to be equivalent to the requirement that  $\lim_n Q_n(F) = Q(F)$  for all  $F$  of the form  $F(g) = e^{-g(f)}$  for some continuous boundedly supported  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ . This class  $\mathcal{F}$  is the sufficiently rich class of functions required for our expectation values to determine our measures: Equality of expectations for  $F$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  implies equality of expectations for all bounded Borel-measurable  $F$  [12, Section 6.4].

We must bear in mind that ordinary theorems guaranteeing existence and uniqueness of solutions to differential equations do not extend to our abstract setting. The derivatives on the left-hand side of (1) might not exist, and, in the presence of unbounded  $S$ , we might have infinity minus infinity on the right-hand side. Our proofs are constructive, so the meaningfulness of the equation will follow from the properties of the proffered solutions. We prove a reasonable version of uniqueness in the non-epistatic case. In the general epistatic case, we have not yet ruled out multiple alternative meaningful solutions; there could be a complicated mathematical question lurking here.

#### 4. MATHEMATICAL RESULTS

We will define the solution in terms of a certain random measure on  $\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^+$ . We define  $\Pi$  to be the Poisson random measure on this space, with intensity measure  $\nu \otimes \text{Lebesgue}$ . Define a time-homogeneous  $\mathcal{G}$ -valued Markov process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  by  $X_t := X_0 + \int_{\mathcal{M} \times [0, t]} \delta_m d\Pi(m, u)$ , where  $X_0$  is a random measure with distribution  $P_0$ , independent of  $\Pi$ . Each realization of  $X_t$  may be pictured as a discrete set of points, possibly with duplication; as time passes, new points accrete.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that the set of times  $t$  such that  $\mathbb{E} \exp\left(\int_0^t -S(X_u) du\right) S(X_t) < \infty$  has a positive supremum  $T$ . Then the equations (1) have a solution on  $[0, T)$ , given by*

$$(3) \quad P_t F = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp\left(-\int_0^t S(X_u) du\right) F(X_t) \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp\left(-\int_0^t S(X_u) du\right) \right]}.$$

*Proof.* Define a linear operator on the continuous functions on the genotype space by

$$(4) \quad AF = \int [F(\cdot + \delta_m) - F(\cdot)] d\nu(m) - S(\cdot)F(\cdot).$$

Given an integrable function  $\sigma(t)$ , put  $\tilde{P}_t = \exp\left(-\int_0^t \sigma(u) du\right) P_t$ . If we can arrange for  $\sigma(t)$  to equal the average selective cost  $P_t S$ , then, thanks to the chain rule, the derivative of  $\tilde{P}_t F$  must equal  $\tilde{P}_t A F$ .

The operator  $A$  may be unbounded if  $\nu$  has infinite total mass, but it is well-defined on the class  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $A$  is the generator of a sub-Markovian semigroup  $(\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . By the Feynman-Kac formula [13, Section III.19],  $\Gamma_t$  may be described as

$$(5) \quad \Gamma_t F(g) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp\left(-\int_0^t S(g + X_u - X_0) du\right) F(g + X_t - X_0) \right].$$

Now, the semigroup  $(\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$  solves the forward equation  $\frac{d}{dt} \Gamma_t F = \Gamma_t (A F)$  and it follows that  $\tilde{P}_t F = \tilde{P}_0 \Gamma_t F$ , which equals the numerator of (3). By the condition on  $T$ ,  $\tilde{P}_t S$  is finite on  $[0, T)$ , equalling the derivative of  $\tilde{P}_t I$ , so that we may put  $P_t F = \tilde{P}_t F / \tilde{P}_t I$  and achieve  $\sigma(t) = P_t S < \infty$  on  $[0, T)$ .  $\square$

When  $\nu(\mathcal{M})$  is finite, we can order the points put down by  $X_t$  according to their arrival times  $\tau(1), \tau(2) \dots$  and write  $Y_n := X_{\tau(n)}$ . Let  $J_n$  be the indicator function of genotypes with exactly  $n$  (possibly overlapping) points:  $J_n(g) = 1$  if  $g(\mathcal{M}) = n$ , and 0 otherwise. Renewal theory calculations turn (3) into a handy formula for probabilities of  $n$ -point genotypes:

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose  $\nu(\mathcal{M}) < \infty$  and  $P_0$  puts unit mass at the null state, on which  $S = 0$ . Then the solution (3) may be written as  $P_t F = \tilde{P}_t F / \tilde{P}_t \mathbf{1}$  with*

$$(6) \quad \tilde{P}_t J_n F = \nu(\mathcal{M})^n e^{-\nu(\mathcal{M})t} \mathbb{E} (S(Y_1) \dots S(Y_n))^{-1} H_{t,n} F(Y_n).$$

Here  $H_{t,n}$  is the conditional probability, conditional on  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ , that  $\sum Z_j / S(Y_j) < t$ , where  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  are independent unit rate exponential random variables.

If  $\sum \nu(\mathcal{M})^n \mathbb{E}((S(Y_1) \dots S(Y_n))^{-1})$  is finite,  $P_t$  converges in distribution as  $t$  goes to infinity. If the sum is infinite,  $P_t J_n$  goes to zero for all  $n$ .

*Proof.* Consider the numerator of (3) with  $J_n F$  in place of  $F$ . The integral inside the exponential is the sum of terms  $S(Y_j)(\tau(j+1) \wedge t - \tau(j))$  for  $j$  from 1 to  $n$ . Conditional on  $X_t$  having total mass  $n$ , the  $Y$ 's are independent of the  $\tau$ 's, and the  $\tau$ 's are distributed like the order statistics of a sample of  $n$  uniform random variables on  $[0, t]$ . Multiple integrations show that this numerator equals  $\tilde{P}_t J_n F$  as specified in (6). Noting that  $H_{t,n} \leq H_{t,n-1}$ , we bound  $\tilde{P}_t J_n S$  by  $\nu(\mathcal{M}) \tilde{P}_t J_{n-1}$ . Summing over  $n$ , we find  $\tilde{P}_t S \leq \nu(\mathcal{M}) \tilde{P}_t \mathbf{1} \leq \nu(\mathcal{M})$ , verifying the supremum condition for all finite  $T$ . The factors of  $e^{-\nu(\mathcal{M})t}$  in the numerator and denominator of  $P_t J_n F$  cancel. The conditional probability  $H_{t,n}$ , is monotone increasing in  $t$  toward a limit of 1 for each choice of  $n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ . Hence the limit claim follows by monotone convergence.  $\square$

In demographic applications we will typically be interested in counting the average number of mutations of a given type in the population. For  $B$  a measurable subset of  $\mathcal{M}$ , write  $R_t(B)$  for the expected number of mutations from  $B$  at time  $t$ ; that is,  $R_t(B) = \int_{\mathcal{G}} g(B) dP_t(g)$ . Taking  $F(g) = g(B)$ , the numerator in (3) may be computed as  $\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{M} \times [0,t]} G(m, t, \Pi) d\Pi(m, u)$ , where  $G(m, t, \Pi)$  is the function  $\exp(-\int_0^t S(X_u) du) \mathbf{1}_{\{m \in B\}}$ . The Palm distribution of  $\Pi$  for the point  $(m, u)$  (that is, the distribution of  $\Pi$  “conditioned” to have a point at  $(m, u)$ ) is just the distribution of  $\Pi + \delta_{(m,u)}$  [12, Example 12.1(b)]. The Palm integral formula [12, Proposition 12.1.IV] then gives us a density for  $R_t$ :

**Corollary 2.** *The measure  $R_t$  has a density with respect to  $\nu$ , which is*

$$(7) \quad \rho_t(x) := \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\int_0^t S(X_u) du) \int_0^t \exp(-\int_\tau^t [S(X_u + \delta_x) - S(X_u)] du) d\tau]}{\mathbb{E} \exp(-\int_0^t S(X_u) du)}.$$

This formula allows us to compare the influences of different cost functions.

**Corollary 3.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied, and suppose that  $S$  is sub-additive; that is,  $S(g + g') \leq S(g) + S(g')$ . Define the corresponding additive cost function  $\bar{S}(g) := \int S(\delta_m) g(dm)$ . Let  $P_t$  and  $\bar{P}_t$  be corresponding genotype distributions produced by (3). Then  $P_t F \geq \bar{P}_t F$  for any linear  $F$  of the form  $F(g) = g(f)$ , where  $f$  is nonnegative, measurable, and has bounded support.*

In contrast to the additive case, genotypes subject to sub-additive cost functions may tend to explode. In age-structured models, the total effect of mutations acting after some given age is limited, regardless of how many of them may accumulate. If the rate at which some class of mutations is generated exceeds any countervailing selection-cost increment which they may incur, the number of mutations in that class may be expected to grow without limit.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Let  $B \subset \mathcal{M}$  be a subset with finite  $\nu$ -mass. Suppose  $0 \leq S(g + g^*) - S(g) \leq s$  for all  $g$  and for all those  $g^*$  with masses only at points in  $B$ , that is, with  $g^*(B) = g^*(\mathcal{M})$ . Let  $J_n^*$  be the indicator function of the set of genotypes with  $g(B) = n$ . Then  $s < \nu(B)$  implies that  $P_t J_n^*$  goes to zero for every  $n$  as  $t$  goes to infinity.*

*Proof.* We write our Poisson process  $X_t$  as  $X_t^* + X_t^r$ , where  $X_t^*$  is the restriction of  $X_t$  to  $B$  and  $X_t^r$  is the remainder. These components are independent of each other. Let  $U := \inf\{u : X_t(B) > 0\}$  be the arrival time of the first point in  $B$ , an exponential random variable with mean  $1/\nu(B)$ . We have

$$(8) \quad 0 \leq \int_0^t S(X_u^r + X_u^*) - S(X_u^r) du \leq s(t - U) \wedge 0.$$

To bound  $P_t J_n^*$ , we write the numerator of (3),  $\tilde{P}_t J_n^*$ , as the expectation of a product of three factors,  $\exp(-\int_0^t S(X_u^r) du)$ ,  $\exp(-\int_0^t S(X_u) - S(X_u^r) du)$  and  $J_n^*(X_t^*)$ . The second factor is bounded above by 1 and the third factor is independent of the first. The denominator of (3),  $\tilde{P}_t I$ , has the same first factor, the same second factor, bounded below by  $\exp(-s(t - U) \wedge 0)$ , and a third factor identically equal to 1. Using independence, we may cancel the expectations of the first factors in numerator and denominator, so that  $P_t J_n^*$  is less than or equal to the quotient of  $\mathbb{E} J_n^*(X_t^*)$  and  $\mathbb{E} \exp(-s(t - U) \wedge 0)$ . Writing  $\nu^*$  for  $\nu(B)$ , this quotient equals  $(\nu^* t)^n / n!$  divided by  $(\nu^* e^{(\nu^* - s)t} - s) / (\nu^* - s)$ . The quotient goes to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $n$ .  $\square$

In the non-epistatic case, when the cost function  $S$  is additive, a proof of uniqueness and an eminently computable formula can be obtained.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose that  $S$  is an additive (nonepistatic) cost function such that the expectation value  $\nu(S \wedge 1)$  is finite and suppose that  $P_0$  is an initial probability measure such that  $P_0 S$  is finite. Then the equations (1) have a unique solution on  $[0, \infty)$ . A random measure chosen according to  $P_t$  may be represented as the sum of two independent random measures. The first component is a Poisson random measure with intensity  $(1/S(m))(1 - e^{-S(m)t}) d\nu(m)$ . The second is the initial measure  $P_0$ , tilted by the weighting  $e^{-t g S}$ . That is, the second component  $Q_t$  satisfies  $Q_t F = \tilde{Q}_t F / \tilde{Q}_t 1$  with*

$$(9) \quad \tilde{Q}_t F = \int e^{-S(g)t} F(g) dP_0(g)$$

*If  $\nu$  is finite, this solution is identical with that given in Theorem 1.*

*Proof.* Linearity of  $S$  allows us to solve (1) by solving a certain first-order linear partial differential equation of the McKendrick type familiar to demographers:

$$(10) \quad \frac{\partial h(t, z)}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial h(t, z)}{\partial z} = \zeta(z) + \sigma(t).$$

We start with test functions of the combined form  $F(g) = e^{-g f - z S(g)}$  for positive real  $z$  and bounded non-negative  $f$  with bounded support. Here  $\zeta(z) := \nu(\exp(-f(m) - z S(m)) - 1)$ , and  $\sigma(t)$  is any integrable non-negative function (which serves as a candidate for  $P_t S$ ). The boundary conditions are  $h(0, z) = \log P_0 F$ . Finiteness of the right-hand side of (10) follows from the bounds on  $f$  and  $\nu(S \wedge 1)$ . We solve (10) uniquely for  $h$  by using the method of characteristic curves [14] to transform it into a system of ordinary differential equations. We then set  $P_t F = \exp(h(t, z))$ .

Additivity of  $S$  makes the derivative of this  $P_t F$  equal the right-hand side of (1) plus  $(\sigma(t) - P_t S)(P_t F)$ . Also,  $-P_t S$  is the partial derivative of  $h$  with respect to  $z$  at  $z = 0$  and  $f \equiv 0$ , which is the sum  $\nu(1 - e^{tS})$  and  $P_0 S e^{-tS} / P_0 e^{-tS}$ . Setting  $\sigma(t)$  equal to this sum is therefore the unique choice which makes  $P_t$  satisfy (1). Writing out  $h$  and setting  $z = 0$ , we recognize the Laplace functional of the convolution of probability measures specified in the theorem.  $\square$

The first piece of  $P_t$  clearly converges to a Poisson random measure as long as  $\nu/S$  is boundedly finite. But that is not the complete story of asymptotic behavior. In general, the influence of  $P_0$  in  $Q_t$  may persist. In the limit, however, we may apply Varadhan's Lemma [15, Theorem III.13] to show that  $Q_t$  becomes concentrated on the set of genotypes of minimum selective cost.

**Corollary 4.** *Suppose  $P_0$  and  $S$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3, that  $\text{supp } P_0$  is compact, and that  $S$  is continuous. Let  $\sigma = \inf\{S(g) : g \in \text{supp } P_0\}$ . If  $\mathcal{O}$  is any open neighborhood of  $\{g \in \text{supp } P_0 : S(g) = \sigma\}$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_t(\mathcal{O}) = 1$ . In particular, if  $P_0\{0\} > 0$ , the tilted measure  $Q_t$  converges to  $\delta_0$ .*

Durrett's result [6] may be found as a special case either of Corollary 4 or of Corollary 1.

## 5. APPLICATIONS TO THE THEORY OF LONGEVITY

We survey briefly a few applications to questions in the biodemography of longevity, to be spelled out in later work. We take the space of mutations  $\mathcal{M}$  to be  $C[0, \infty)$ , the continuous real-valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , supplied with any of the usual metrics corresponding to uniform convergence on bounded intervals [16, Section 1.44]. A mutation measure  $\nu$  on this space is the distribution of a stochastic process.

**5.1. Gompertz breakdown.** Charlesworth [7] has suggested a possible origin for Gompertzian (exponentially increasing) hazard rates through a process of mutation-selection balance which fits into our generalized model. Members of a species are taken to be subject to a common high background age-independent hazard rate  $\lambda$  plus age-dependent contributions from mutations. Each mutation  $m$  may be represented as a continuous function  $m(x)$  of age added onto the hazard function for an individual. Charlesworth's elementary models assume constant fertility at all ages above an age  $b$  of sexual maturity, foregoing any *a priori* upper age cutoff.

The selective cost  $S(g)$  for a genotype  $g$  is the decrement to the intrinsic rate of natural increase resulting from the mutations in  $g$ , given by  $S(g) = -r$  where  $r$  is

the solution to Lotka's Equation

$$(11) \quad 1 = \int_b^\infty \lambda \exp\left(-rx - \lambda x + \lambda b - \int_0^x \int_0^x m(a) da dg(m)\right) dx.$$

Note that  $S$  is a non-additive epistatic cost function. Following established practice, Charlesworth substitutes the additive cost function

$$(12) \quad \hat{S}(g) = \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda(x-b)} \wedge 1) \int m(x) dg(m) dx.$$

When  $S$  is re-expressed as a rate per generation rather than per unit time,  $\hat{S}$  is an additive approximation to it.

With additive costs as in (12), Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 give us sufficient conditions for the distribution of genotypes to converge to the Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu/\hat{S}$ . It suffices that the starting state put positive weight on the null state and have compact support and that  $\nu$  and  $\nu/S$  be boundedly finite. Then the average of the hazard rates over genotypes will converge to  $\lambda + \int_{\mathcal{M}} (m(x)/\hat{S}(m)) d\nu(m)$ , equivalent to [7, Eq.4a]. This expression is not, however, the equilibrium aggregate hazard rate for the whole population, because the heterogeneity mediated by the Poisson distribution implies attrition of higher-risk genotypes with advancing age. The Poisson expression for the additive genetic variance and covariance also require modification for age-specific attrition.

Charlesworth focuses on translation families of mutations, which we may write as  $m_y(x) = m_0(x-y)$  with effects only after an age of onset  $y$ . With  $d\nu(m_y) = \nu_0 dy$  on some  $[b', \infty)$ , he displays choices for  $m_0$  which make the average of the hazard rates into an exact Gompertz-Makeham function  $\lambda + \nu_0 \exp(-\lambda(x-b))$  on the support of  $\nu$ , and others which approximate Gompertz-Makeham shapes for large  $x$ . (These shapes do not include heterogeneity corrections.) It is understood that the additive approximation (12) deteriorates as the exponential term comes to dominate the background, implying faster than exponential increase at high ages. A “wall of death” with an infinite equilibrium mean hazard rate is predicted by this additive theory to appear at ages at which reproduction has come to an end. [7, p. 60]

Theorem 2 implies a more dramatic breakdown. The mean hazard function can actually reach infinity at ages at which fertility is still strictly positive, if the full epistatic cost function  $S$  in (11) is kept in place of the additive approximation (12). Contrary to additive theory, the “wall of death” is not tied to the end of reproduction but involves a fine-tuned balance between mutation rates and tapering costs.

**5.2. Heterogeneity and Equilibria.** In all mutation accumulation models the population is heterogeneous. Different subsets of the population carry different

numbers and mixes of mutations. The larger the mean number of mutations, the less dispersion will be seen among the hazard functions of most (randomly selected) members, but there will also be a representation of rare cases at the extremes of the heterogeneity distribution. Corollary 4 shows these extreme cases to be crucial for the limiting states.

Consider a Poisson equilibrium under Theorem 3 produced with additive costs and with a mean total number of points in the hundreds. Less than a millionth of the population would carry a total count of mutations less than half the mean. But if fate removed them, then the remaining population would converge to a new equilibrium, with much higher mean hazards, incorporating the tilted component from Corollary 4.

**5.3. Gaussian process mutations.** The cases considered in 5.1, in which a constant background mortality imprints a Gompertzian pattern onto increments to the hazard function, share the property that every mutation is deleterious at every affected age. Is this property essential to the imprinting, or can the age-specific force of selection readily produce the same kind of outcomes with mutations that mix positive and negative effects?

Our framework allows quite general pleiotropic specifications. A natural starting point is the case of Gaussian processes. The fitness cost for this brief discussion will be the additive approximation (12). Suppose that the mutation process generates mutations proportionately to a positive-real-parameter Gaussian process with expectation  $a(x)$  and covariance function  $c(x, x')$ , conditioned on fitness cost bounded away from 0. That is, if we look at the pattern of age effects in a randomly chosen mutation, it looks like a realization of this Gaussian process, subject to  $\hat{S}(m) > s > 0$  for some  $s$ . The overall rate of mutation is a constant  $\nu_0$ . For rigorous treatment, we also need to condition on events which keep the resulting hazard functions non-negative and insure the validity of the additive approximation, but here we shall assume that the choices of parameters keep misbehavior rare enough that it can be neglected.

The average over genotypes of the hazard function is given by

$$(13) \quad h(x) = \lambda + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{m(x)d\nu(m)}{\int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda z} dz \int_0^{z+b} m(y)dy}.$$

The denominator  $\hat{S}(m)$  is obtained from (12) by integration by parts. Since the numerator and denominator of (13), linear functionals of  $m$ , are both Gaussian random variables, we can describe their joint distribution simply by computing their covariance. The conditional expectation of  $m(x)/\hat{S}(m)$  conditional on  $\hat{X}(m)$ , is obtained via linear regression.

When  $a(x) \equiv 0$ , the conditional expectation turns out to be independent of  $\hat{S}(m)$ , making the integral in (13) independent of the bound  $s$  (except for a small change in the proportionality constant) and equal to  $\nu_0 \mathbb{E} m(x) \hat{S}(m) / \text{Var}(S(m))$ . For processes with zero mean, then, we may treat  $s$  as 0. As one example, take the mutations to be realizations of Brownian motion, so that  $c(x, x') = x \wedge x'$  and  $a(x) = 0$ . The increment to the mean hazard rate then has the form  $c_1 - c_2 e^{-\lambda x}$  for  $x \geq b$ .

Can any Gaussian mutation process with zero mean generate approximations to Gompertz-Makeham hazard functions? The covariance kernel must satisfy  $|c(x, y)| \leq c(x, x)/2 + c(y, y)/2$ . With  $a(x) \equiv 0$ , the incremental mortality is bounded above by  $c_1 + c_2 c(x, x)$  for constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ . The mortality thus cannot be exponentially increasing over a long range of ages, unless this exponential increase is built into the mutation process itself.

**5.4. Prospects.** The generalized model for mutation-selection balance presented here can be applied widely. Because the model allows mutations with a mixture of positive and negative effects, it gives scope to some blending of ideas about mutation accumulation with ideas about antagonistic pleiotropy. It offers a handle on responses to changing fitness conditions through the finite-time solutions, along with machinery for treating epistatic cost functions. The brief applications in this section show that prevailing additive approximations can give a misleading picture of qualitative behavior.

Future research needs to take up uniqueness and limiting behavior in the full epistatic setting. A further high priority is a finite-population counterpart of the infinite-population model. In related contexts, Durrett and Levin [17] have shown how careful finite-population modeling can upset conclusions drawn from infinite-population models. We expect many implications of our results to carry over to finite populations, but some novel dynamics may await discovery.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D.R.S. was supported by Grant K12-AG00981 from the National Institute on Aging, S.N.E. was supported in part by Grant DMS-00-71468 from the National Science Foundation and by the Miller Foundation, and K.W.W. was supported by Grant P01-008454 from the National Institute on Aging. The authors thank Montgomery Slatkin for helpful discussions early in this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Wachter, K. W. (2003) in *Life Span: Evolutionary, Ecological, and demographic perspectives*, Population and Development Review, eds. Carey, J. R & Tuljapurkar, S. (The Population Council, New York) Vol. 29 (Supplement), pp. 270–291.
- [2] Medawar, P. (1952) *An unsolved problem in biology: An inaugural lecture delivered at University College, London, 6 December, 1951*. (H. K. Lewis and Co., London).
- [3] Hamilton, W. D. (1966) *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **12**, 12–45.
- [4] Charlesworth, B. (1994) *Evolution in age-structured populations*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [5] Bürger, R. (1998) *Genetica* **102/103**, 279–98.
- [6] Durrett, R. (2002) *Probability Models for DNA Sequence Evolution*, Probability and its Applications (New York). (Springer-Verlag, New York).
- [7] Charlesworth, B. (2001) *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **210**, 47–65.
- [8] Turelli, M. (1984) *Theoretical Population Biology* **25**, 138–93.
- [9] Bürger, R. (2000) *The mathematical theory of selection, recombination, and mutation*. (John Wiley, Chichester, New York).
- [10] Del Moral, P & Miclo, L. (2000) *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **86**, 193–216.
- [11] Kallenberg, O. (2002) *Foundations of modern probability*, Probability and its Applications (New York). (Springer-Verlag, New York), Second edition.
- [12] Daley, D. J & Vere-Jones, D. (1988) *An introduction to the theory of point processes*, Springer Series in Statistics. (Springer-Verlag, New York).
- [13] Rogers, L. C. G & Williams, D. (2000) *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) Vol. 1, 2nd edition.
- [14] Evans, L. C. (1998) *Partial differential equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics. (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI) Vol. 19.
- [15] den Hollander, F. (2000) *Large Deviations*. (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI).
- [16] Rudin, W. (1991) *Functional Analysis*. (McGraw-Hill, New York), 2nd edition.
- [17] Durrett, R & Levin, S. (1994) *Theoretical Population Biology* **46**, 363–94.