

## BME 205 Assignment 8 Explanation

### *Wright-Fisher*

I found the best way to determine the efficacy of my Wright-Fisher(WF) algorithm and to verify the associated outputs of my program, it was best to run a smaller simulation. In the hopes that tuning the config and demography parameters might help prove the correctness and biological realism of the WF model.

parameter,value	generation,population_size
mutation_rate,1e-8	0, 10000
sequence_length,1000	200, 100
total_generations,500	260, 10000
selection_coefficient,0.1	
beneficial_mutation_time,1025	

The results and respective parameters clearly demonstrate, at the onset of the bottleneck, a sudden and significant increase in the number of segregating mutations, nucleotide diversity, and theta-Watterson estimate. This is likely due to a small subset of previously rare alleles being selected by pure chance.

200	198	10000	1	0.000000	0.102171	0.000000
201	199	10000	1	0.000000	0.102171	0.000000
202	200	100	1	0.000039	0.193148	0.000000
203	201	100	1	0.000058	0.193148	0.000000
204	202	100	1	0.000039	0.193148	0.000000
205	203	100	1	0.000058	0.193148	0.000000
206	204	100	1	0.000020	0.193148	0.000000

Though as the bottleneck persists, strong genetic drift rapidly eliminates these otherwise fringe alleles slowly eliminating these initially strong variations, this is reflected in the falling Watterson's estimate and nucleotide diversity.

258	100	0	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
259	100	0	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
260	10000	2	0.000000	0.204342	0.000000
261	10000	2	0.000001	0.204342	0.000000
262	10000	3	0.000001	0.306513	0.000000
263	10000	2	0.000001	0.204342	0.000000
264	10000	3	0.000002	0.306513	0.000000

Once the population size returns to ancestral values, the new mutations begin to accumulate and allele frequencies stabilize. Producing a gradual rise in Watterson's, nucleotide diversity, and positive selection of traits.

266	264	10000	3	0.000002	0.306513	0.000000
267	265	10000	3	0.000003	0.306513	0.000000
268	266	10000	3	0.000003	0.306513	0.000000
269	267	10000	3	0.000002	0.306513	0.000000

This example in particular doesn't show the beneficial allele rising in frequency, and this is likely due to it not surviving the genetic dynamics of the bottleneck(but it can also be expected to rise to prominence post-bottleneck).

### ***Coalescent Simulation***

In order to verify the piecewise-constant coalescent algorithm, I found it helpful to once again develop two baseline tests that can mirror expected results from known config and demography parameters to recognize the differences between constant pop and bottleneck populations.

The results for the constant-population test like total tree length, time to mrca, num mutations, theta estimate, and nucleotide diversity all converge around expected values for a stable Wright-Fisher population for expected levels of genetic variation.

```
time_ago,population_size
0,1000
```

```
parameter,value
mutation_rate,1e-6
sequence_length,1000
sample_size,5
replicates,5
```

replicate	total_tree_length	time_to_mrca	num_mutations	theta_estimate	nucleotide_diversity
1	10923.882806	4826.247325	13 0.006240	0.005400	
2	10669.103236	4327.168847	11 0.005280	0.005400	
3	10735.331641	4891.171127	9 0.004320	0.005400	
4	6097.209447	2455.927364	4 0.001920	0.002000	
5	6273.615157	1976.332386	5 0.002400	0.002200	

Specifically; tree length corresponds to  $4 * N * H_4(\text{harmonic}) \sim 4 * 1000 * 2.083 \sim 8.3k$ ; nucleotide diversity is described by  $4 * N * \mu \sim 4 * 1000 * 10e-6 \sim 0.004$  (per site); expected time to MRCA =  $4N(1 - 1/n) = 4000 * (1-0.2) = 3.2$  k generations

On the other hand, the bottleneck test produces very different signatures. We see tree lengths shrink significantly, MRCA occurs much more recently, mutation counts drop to near zero, and both theta Watterson and nucleotide frequency collapses.

replicate	total_tree_length	time_to_mrca	num_mutations	theta_estimate	nucleotide_diversity
1	92377.419500	43312.473254	97 0.046560	0.039400	
2	71971.526528	33437.842815	68 0.032640	0.027600	
3	86091.446290	26613.169919	89 0.042720	0.044600	
4	17564.341988	5615.512679	13 0.006240	0.006200	
5	56449.111995	21579.035859	50 0.024000	0.025000	
6	7043.931344	3402.117053	10 0.004800	0.006000	
7	45524.122149	22649.634407	45 0.021600	0.027000	
8	82084.122958	38515.203697	89 0.042720	0.036000	
9	32451.469990	10731.866610	30 0.014400	0.013800	
10	26018.859515	9797.777650	27 0.012960	0.013400	

```
parameter,value
mutation_rate,1e-6
sequence_length,1000
sample_size,5
replicates,10
```

```
time_ago,population_size
0,10000
50,100
100,10000
```

Comparing the results from empirical values, tree length  $\sim 83.3k$ , num mutations  $\sim 83.3$ , nucleotide diversity  $\sim 0.04$  per site. However, in and around bottleneck events, the expected tree length will be much smaller than the empirical  $83.3k$  and this is reflected in replicate 6 wherein the tree length is a mere  $7k$ , the number of mutations is 10, and nucleotide diversity is 0.006!

Each of these tests and results confirms the efficacy of the model in reflecting a severe loss of genetic diversity expected during bottleneck events and the correlation of our output values in response to these changes.