

# Density-dependent selection and the limits of relative fitness

Jason Bertram <sup>1,\*</sup>

Joanna Masel <sup>1</sup>

1. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

\* Corresponding author; e-mail: jbertram@email.arizona.edu.

*Keywords:* Lottery model, competitive Lotka-Volterra,  $r/K$ -selection, interference competition,  $R^*$  theory, eco-evo.

*Author contributions:* JB and JM conceptualized the manuscript. JB did the formal analysis. JB wrote the manuscript with review and editing from JM.

*Running title:* Density-dependence and relative fitness

*Acknowledgments:* We thank Peter Chesson and Joachim Hermisson for many constructive comments on an earlier and quite different version of this manuscript. This work was financially supported by the National Science Foundation (DEB-1348262) and the John Templeton Foundation (60814).

# Density-dependent selection and the limits of relative fitness

## Abstract

Selection is commonly described in terms of relative fitness. Yet much of the ecological theory of selection in density-regulated populations seems to be incompatible with widely-used, constant-density relative fitness models such as the Wright-Fisher. Here we analyze the population ecological limits of relative fitness using a novel generalization of the Wright-Fisher model in which population density depends dynamically on the demographic rates of the types present. Our model clearly distinguishes between density-dependent selection and selection-dependent density. These two effects are confounded in many standard models of density-regulated population growth. Both effects are necessary, in combination with strong selection, for relative fitness to break down in populations close to demographic equilibrium. Remarkably, both effects are not sufficient: we show that strong selection on a density-regulating trait that is subject to density-dependent selection can conform to the relative fitness description almost exactly. We reiterate the importance of reproductive excesses, an aspect of selection omitted in many population growth models, which implies that even strong selection need not affect density in many species. Our model also offers a possible alternative to relative fitness when the latter is untenable, as is likely the case far from demographic equilibrium.

(195 words)

## 21 Introduction

22 There are a variety of different measures of fitness. Some widely used examples in evo-  
23 lutionary ecology are expected lifetime reproductive ratio  $R_0$ , intrinsic population growth  
24 rate  $r$ , saturation population density (often labeled “ $K$ ”) (Benton and Grant, 2000), and  
25 invasion fitness (Metz et al., 1992). In addition, “relative fitness” is the standard in much  
26 of evolutionary biology, particularly evolutionary genetics, where attention is generally re-  
27 stricted to relative genotypic proportions (Barton et al., 2007, pp. 468). The variety of  
28 fitness measures is not problematic in itself, because different measures may be more useful  
29 in different circumstances. But it should be clear how the measure being used is connected to  
30 the processes of birth and death which govern population biology (Metcalf and Pavard, 2007;  
31 Doebeli et al., 2017). While such a connection is fairly clear for absolute fitness measures  
32 like  $r$ , relative fitness seems largely divorced from population biology. It has even been pro-  
33 posed that relative fitness be justified from measure theory, abandoning population biology  
34 altogether (Wagner, 2010). Given the ubiquitous use of relative fitness, it is important that  
35 we understand its population ecological basis, both to clarify its domain of applicability, and  
36 as part of the broader challenge of synthesizing ecology and evolution.

37 Constant relative fitness values can be justified as a linear approximation (Ewens, 2004,  
38 pp. 277) (Charlesworth, 1994, Chap. 4) which is close to exact provided that selection  
39 is sufficiently weak and stable over time. Yet strong, temporally-variable selection occurs  
40 widely in nature and the lab, including in wild *Drosophila*, where population density varies  
41 by orders of magnitude each seasonal cycle (Messer et al., 2016; Bergland et al., 2014).  
42 The question is whether relative fitness can be used when selection is not vanishingly weak.  
43 In age-structured populations that reproduce by outcrossing, selection cannot in general  
44 be represented in terms of type-specific relative-fitness constants unless selection is weak  
45 (Charlesworth, 1994, Chap. 4). We will therefore restrict our attention to asexual haploids

with little or no age structure, where the relative fitness description may be valid even if selection is strong. This simplification also makes it easier to grasp the population ecological underpinnings of selection, as opposed to the role of mating systems or complex changes in age structure.

The basis of relative fitness is straightforward in the absence of crowding: it simply represents differences in intrinsic population growth rate. In discrete time, the change in frequency of type  $i$  is  $\Delta p_i = \left(\frac{W_i}{\bar{W}} - 1\right) p_i$ , where  $W_i$  is the intrinsic absolute growth factor of type  $i$ , and  $\bar{W} = \sum_i W_i p_i$  is the population mean  $W$ . Here we can rescale  $W$  however we please and replace it with “relative fitness”  $w$  without affecting the ratio  $\frac{W_i}{\bar{W}} = \frac{w_i}{\bar{w}}$ . In continuous time, the canonical selection equation is  $\frac{dp_i}{dt} = (r_i - \bar{r})p_i$ , where  $W$  is replaced by the intrinsic exponential growth rate  $r$  (Crow et al., 1970, pp. 26). If there are two types present, a wildtype and a mutant for instance, then the continuous time canonical selection equation can be written as

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = sp_i(1 - p_i), \tag{1}$$

where the constant selection coefficient  $s$  is the difference in  $r$  between types. The corresponding adaptive sweeps follow a logistic curve.

The difficulty with Eq. (1) arises in crowded populations. Since crowded and uncrowded conditions are so different, we expect that  $s$  will often depend on density (Travis et al., 2013). Eq. (1) is then no longer a complete description of selection — we would also need to specify a model for how density is changing. Note that frequency-dependent selection does not raise similar problems; Eq. (1) is still a complete description of selection even if its behavior is more complicated due to  $s$  depending on frequency. Population genetics traditionally evades the issue of density-dependent selection by simply assuming that total population density  $N$  has reached its equilibrium value, which is assumed to be a fixed constant. The selection coefficient  $s$  now abstractly parameterizes the rate at which selection

changes relative frequencies, and no longer corresponds to differences in intrinsic growth rates  $r$ .

However, MacArthur famously argued that when population growth is density-regulated, selection in crowded populations is intimately connected to the ability to keep growing at higher densities than other types can tolerate (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967). The classic example is the logistic model, where the type with the greatest saturation population density “ $K$ ” excludes the others (Fig. 1a). Similarly, the “ $R^*$  rule”, a central tenet of resource competition theory, states that when growth is limited by a single homogeneous consumable resource, the type able to deplete the resource to the lowest equilibrium density  $R^*$  excludes the others (Grover, 1997). Differences in  $R^*$  will often entail differences in saturation density. The Lotka-Volterra competition model also couples selection in crowded populations to density except in special cases (Smouse, 1976; Mallet, 2012). In these examples, both  $N$  and  $s$  change during, and as a result of, adaptive sweeps. It would therefore seem that the ubiquitous constant- $N$ , relative fitness description of selection is incompatible with a huge class of population ecological processes driving selection (Fig. 1b), even in the absence of age-structure and mating.

In light of this difficulty, the relative fitness description has been justified in broadly two different ways for crowded populations (we do not discuss Wagner’s [2010] measurement-theoretical justification, which is independent of population biology). The first is to simply assume that selection is density-independent but relax the assumption of constant  $N$  by allowing density to change as a result of selective sweeps (Barton et al., 2007, pp. 468) (Prout, 1980). Obviously this does not address the problem that  $s$  can, in reality, depend on density. Type-specific responses to density are at the center of MacArthur’s argument and the density-dependent selection literature that grew out of it (e.g. (Roughgarden, 1979)).

The second justification, which primarily grew out of a controversy over Haldane’s “cost of selection”, is to appeal to the existence of a “reproductive excess” of juveniles that are more



Figure 1: Selection in crowded environments shown as a phase diagram for the densities of two types  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ . (a) The logistic model  $\frac{dn_1}{dt} = r_1(1 - \frac{n_1+n_2}{K_1})n_1$  and  $\frac{dn_2}{dt} = r_2(1 - \frac{n_1+n_2}{K_2})n_2$  with  $r_1 = r_2$  and  $K_1 > K_2$ . (b) The constant- $N$ , relative fitness description of selection.

fragile than their adult counterparts (Turner and Williamson, 1968; Kimura and Crow, 1969; Nei, 1971). Selection can then be concentrated at the juvenile phase, uncoupling selection from population density at the adult phase unless it is so strong that the reproductive excess is depleted. This justifies Eq. (1) because, for a population in demographic equilibrium, selective sweeps do not affect density, and so the density-dependence of selection does not matter. Unfortunately this reproductive excess literature is also poorly integrated with population ecology. Kimura and Crow (1969) took constant  $N$  as a requirement and then derived some variants of the logistic model that satisfy this requirement. Nei (1971) proposed a model with an explicit representation of reproductive excess, but used an unusual model of competition based on pair-wise interactions which was only defined for at most two different types. As a result, the role of reproductive excesses in justifying Eq. (1) is still largely verbal.

Here we study the population ecology of relative fitness using a novel model of density-dependent population growth based on territorial contests. Rather than attempting to make

sense of relative fitness in existing standard models of population growth (e.g. (Kimura and Crow, 1969; Mallet, 2012)), we instead do the reverse, and attempt to make population ecological sense of the widely-used Wright-Fisher relative-fitness model. Our starting point is the classic lottery model of territorial contest (Sale, 1977; Chesson and Warner, 1981). Like the Wright-Fisher model, the classic lottery assumes a saturated population with constant  $N$ , and fitness involves a product of fertility and juvenile viability (Crow et al., 1970, pp. 185), but unlike the Wright-Fisher model, generations can overlap. Our first task is to generalize the lottery model to create a variable-density version of the Wright-Fisher model with overlapping generations (sections “Model” and “Analytical approximation of the variable-density lottery”).

Equipped with this new model, we turn to the evaluation of Eq. (1). We first discuss selection on the ability to contest territories, which behaves like a pure constant- $N$ , relative fitness trait, and discuss how this fits with MacArthur’s analysis of selection in crowded populations (section “ $K$ -selection and selection-dependent density”). We then consider selection on density-regulating traits (section “Density-regulating traits and the threat of strong selection”), and conclude by contrasting the classical density-dependent selection literature with our results (“Discussion”).

## Model

### Assumptions and definitions

We assume that reproductively mature individuals (“adults”) each require their own territory to survive and reproduce. All territories are identical, and the total number of territories is  $T$ . Time advances in discrete iterations, each representing the time from birth to reproductive maturity. In a given iteration, the number of adults of the  $i$ ’th type will be denoted by  $n_i$ , the total number of adults by  $N = \sum_i n_i$ , and the number of unoccupied territories by




Figure 2: Each iteration of our model has three elements. First, propagules are produced by adults and dispersed at random (only propagules landing on unoccupied territories are shown). Some territories may receive zero propagules. Lottery competition then occurs in each unoccupied territory that receives a propagule (only illustrated in one territory). Each type has a probability proportional to  $c_i x_i$  of securing a given territory, where  $c_i$  measures competitive ability and  $x_i$  is the number of propagules that disperse there. In the illustrated territory, the black type disperses more propagules but is a poorer competitor. Territories are then made available by deaths among those adults present at the start of the iteration (red crosses).

$U = T - N$ . We assume that the  $n_i$  are large enough that stochastic fluctuations in the  $n_i$  (“drift”) can be ignored (with  $T$  also assumed large to allow for small type densities  $n_i/T$ ).

Each iteration, adults produce new offspring (“propagules”). These disperse at random, regardless of distance from their parents, and independently of each other (e.g. there is no avoidance of territories crowded with propagules). We assume that adults cannot be ousted by juveniles, so that propagules landing on occupied territories are doomed. We assume that each adult from type  $i$  produces a constant number  $b_i$  of successfully dispersing propagules; the number of propagules dispersing to unoccupied territories is then given by  $m_i = b_i n_i U / T$ . The total number of these propagules will be denoted  $M = \sum_i m_i$ . Note



that due to our assumption of uniform dispersal, the parameter  $b_i$  can be thought of as a measure of “colonization ability”, which combines fecundity and dispersal ability (Levins and Culver, 1971; Tilman, 1994; Bolker and Pacala, 1999).

The number of propagules of the  $i$ ’th type landing in any particular territory is denoted  $x_i$ . We assume that  $x_i$  follows a Poisson distribution  $p_i(x_i) = l_i^{x_i} e^{-l_i} / x_i!$ , where  $l_i = m_i / U$  is the mean territorial propagule density for type  $i$  (the total propagule density will be denoted  $L = \sum_i l_i$ ). This is strictly only an approximation of random dispersal, but it is an excellent approximation given our assumption that the  $n_i$  are large enough that drift can be ignored (Appendix A).

When multiple propagules land on the same territory, the victor is determined by lottery competition: type  $i$  wins a territory with probability  $c_i x_i / \sum_j c_j x_j$ , where  $c_i$  is a constant representing relative competitive ability (Fig. 2). We expect that a fraction  $p_1(x_1) \dots p_G(x_G)$  of the  $U$  unoccupied territories will have the propagule composition  $x_1, \dots, x_G$ . Type  $i$  is expected to win a proportion  $c_i x_i / \sum_j c_j x_j$  of these. Ignoring fluctuations about these two expectations (due to our no-drift, large  $n_i$ , large  $T$  approximation), type  $i$ ’s territorial acquisition is given by

$$\Delta_+ n_i = U \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_G} \frac{c_i x_i}{\sum_j c_j x_j} p_1(x_1) \dots p_G(x_G), \quad (2)$$

where the sum only includes territories with at least one propagule present.

Finally, we assume that adult mortality only occurs in adults present at the start of the iteration, and at a constant, type-specific per-capita rate  $0 \leq d_i \leq 1$ . Thus, the overall change in type abundances is

$$\Delta n_i = \Delta_+ n_i - d_i n_i. \quad (3)$$

Fig. 2 illustrates one iteration of the model.

## Connection to the Wright-Fisher and classic lottery models

In the classic lottery model (Chesson and Warner, 1981), unoccupied territories are assumed to be saturated with propagules from every type  $l_i \gg 1$ . From the law of large numbers, the composition of propagules in each territory will then not deviate appreciably from the mean composition  $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_G$  ( $G$  is the number of types present), and so the probability that type  $i$  wins any particular unoccupied territory is approximately  $c_i l_i / \sum_j c_j l_j$ . Then the numbers of territories won by each type  $\Delta_+ n_1, \Delta_+ n_2, \dots, \Delta_+ n_G$  follow a multinomial distribution with  $U$  trials and success probabilities  $\frac{c_1 l_1}{\sum_j c_j l_j}, \frac{c_2 l_2}{\sum_j c_j l_j}, \dots, \frac{c_G l_G}{\sum_j c_j l_j}$ , respectively. Type  $i$  is expected to win a proportion  $c_i l_i / \sum_j c_j l_j$  of the  $U$  available territories, and deviations from this expected outcome are small (since  $T$  is large by assumption), giving

$$\Delta_+ n_i = \frac{c_i l_i}{\sum_j c_j l_j} U = \frac{c_i l_i}{\bar{c} L} U, \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{c} = \sum_j c_j m_j / M$  is the mean competitive ability for a randomly selected propagule. In section “Analytical approximation of the density-dependent lottery”, we derive a generalization of Eq. (4) that accommodates arbitrary propagule densities  $l_i$ .

There is a close connection between the classic lottery model and the Wright-Fisher model of genetic drift (Svardal et al., 2015). In the Wright-Fisher model, type abundances are sampled each generation from a multinomial distribution with success probabilities  $w_i n_i / \sum_j w_j n_j$ , where  $w$  is relative fitness and the  $n_i$  are type abundances in the preceding generation. Population size  $N$  remains constant. This is equivalent to the classic lottery model with non-overlapping generations ( $d_i = 1$  for all  $i$ ) and relative fitness given by  $w_i = b_i c_i$  i.e. a product of fertility and viability (Crow et al., 1970, pp. 185). Thus, the classic lottery model is essentially the Wright-Fisher model extended to allow overlapping generations, but ignoring drift. This means that our extension of the classic lottery model to arbitrary densities represents a variable-density generalization of the Wright-Fisher model

(we also do not consider drift here).

## Results

### Analytical approximation of the variable-density lottery

Eq. (2) involves an expectation over the time-dependent dispersal distributions  $p_i$ , and is thus too complicated to give intuition about the dynamics of density-dependent lottery competition. We now evaluate this expectation.

Similarly to the high- $l_i$  approximation of the classic lottery model, we replace the  $x_i$  with appropriate mean values, although we cannot simply replace  $x_i$  with  $l_i$  as in Eq. (4). The classic lottery model breaks down for types with low propagule density ( $l_i \ll 1$ ) because territorial acquisition is then not correctly represented by a lottery in each territory with the mean propagule density. For a type with low propagule density  $l_i \ll 1$ , we have  $x_i = 1$  in the territories where its propagules land, and so its growth comes entirely from territories which deviate appreciably from  $l_i$ . To account for this, we separate Eq. (2) into  $x_i = 1$  and  $x_i > 1$  parts. Our more general approximation only requires that there are no large discrepancies in competitive ability (i.e. we do not have  $c_i/c_j \gg 1$  for any two types). We obtain (details in Appendix B)

$$\Delta_+ n_i \approx \left[ e^{-L} + (R_i + A_i) \frac{c_i}{\bar{c}} \right] l_i U, \quad (5)$$

where

$$R_i = \frac{\bar{c} e^{-l_i} (1 - e^{-(L-l_i)})}{c_i + \frac{\bar{c} L - c_i l_i}{L - l_i} \frac{L - 1 + e^{-L}}{1 - (1+L)e^{-L}}},$$

and

$$A_i = \frac{\bar{c} (1 - e^{-l_i})}{\frac{1 - e^{-l_i}}{1 - (1+l_i)e^{-l_i}} c_i l_i + \frac{\bar{c} L - c_i l_i}{L - l_i} \left( L \frac{1 - e^{-L}}{1 - (1+L)e^{-L}} - l_i \frac{1 - e^{-l_i}}{1 - (1+l_i)e^{-l_i}} \right)}.$$

Comparing Eq. (5) to Eq. (4), the classic lottery per-propagule success rate  $c_i/\bar{c}L$

has been replaced by three separate terms. The first,  $e^{-L}$ , accounts for propagules which land alone on unoccupied territories; these territories are won without contest. The second,  $R_i c_i / \bar{c}$ , represents competitive victories when the  $i$  type is a rare invader in a high density population (i.e. it determines invasion fitness (Metz et al., 1992)). The third term,  $A_i c_i / \bar{c}$ , represents competitive victories when the  $i$  type is abundant. The relative importance of these three terms varies with both the overall propagule density  $L$  and the relative propagule frequencies  $l_i / L$ . If  $l_i \gg 1$  for all types, we recover the classic lottery model (only the  $A_i c_i / \bar{c}$  term remains, and  $A_i \rightarrow 1/L$ ).

Fig. 3 shows that Eq. (5) and its components closely approximate simulations of our variable-density lottery model over a wide range of propagule densities. Two types are present, one of which is at low frequency. The growth of the low-frequency type relies crucially on the low-density competition term  $R_i c_i / \bar{c}$ . On the other hand,  $R_i c_i / \bar{c}$  is negligible for the high-frequency type, which depends instead on high density territorial victories. Fig. 3 also shows the breakdown of the classic lottery model at low propagule densities.

Eq. (5) takes a much simpler form if all types are competitively equivalent ( $c_i = c$ ),

$$\Delta_+ n_i = \frac{l_i}{L} (1 - e^{-L}) U. \quad (6)$$

Here  $1 - e^{-L}$  is the fraction of territories that receive at least one propagule under Poisson dispersal,  $(1 - e^{-L})U$  is the total number of territories gained, and type  $i$  receives a fraction  $l_i / L$  of these. Total population density thus grows according to

$$\Delta N = (1 - e^{-L}) U - \sum_i d_i n_i \quad (7)$$




Figure 3: Comparison of the analytical approximation Eq. (5) with simulations. Per-propagule success probability  $\Delta_+ n_i / l_i U$  from the classic lottery model, individual-based simulations of random dispersal and lottery competition, and Eq. (5) and its three components. Two types are present, a rare type with  $c_1 = 1.5$ , and a common type with  $c_2 = 1$ . Simulation points are almost invisible in for the common type due to near exact agreement with Eq. (5). Dashed lines in show the breakdown of the classic lottery model. Parameters:  $m_1 = 10^4$  and  $m_2 = 9 \times 10^4$  and  $U$  varies between  $5 \times 10^3$  and  $10^6$ .

## Selection-dependent density and $K$ -selection

Equipped with our variable-density lottery model, we now start evaluating the validity of Eq. (1). In this section we explore whether we should expect population density to vary as a result of selection (Prout, 1980). Since the idea that density does vary with selection is closely connected to the notion of “ $K$ -selection”, we start by revisiting MacArthur’s analysis of selection in crowded environments (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967).

MacArthur considers a population with two types that have densities  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  subject to density-dependent growth described by

$$\frac{dn_1}{dt} = f_1(n_1, n_2) \quad \frac{dn_2}{dt} = f_2(n_1, n_2). \quad (8)$$

The environment is assumed to remain constant apart from the type densities. The functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  must decline to zero if  $n_1$  or  $n_2$  are sufficiently large, because no population has unlimited resources. This defines the nullclines  $f_1(n_1, n_2) = 0$  and  $f_2(n_1, n_2) = 0$  in  $(n_1, n_2)$  space. The outcome of selection is then determined by the relationship between these nullclines. Specifically, a type will be excluded if its nullcline is completely contained in the region bounded by the other type’s nullcline. In other words, for a type to have the possibility of persisting, it must be able to keep growing to higher densities than the other type can tolerate in some region of  $(n_1, n_2)$  space (Fig. 1a).

To formalize the relationship between nullclines, MacArthur used the symbol “ $K$ ” to label the four intersection points of the nullclines with the  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  axes, specifically  $f_1(K_{11}, 0) = 0$ ,  $f_1(0, K_{12}) = 0$ ,  $f_2(0, K_{22}) = 0$  and  $f_2(K_{21}, 0) = 0$ . These  $K$  values determine whether a region of higher-density growth exists for each type, provided that the nullclines are close to being straight lines. Note that only  $K_{11}$  and  $K_{22}$  are saturation densities akin to the  $K$  parameter in the logistic model; following widespread convention, we will refer to selection on these saturation densities as “ $K$ -selection” (Fig. 1a). The other intersection

points,  $K_{12}$  and  $K_{21}$ , are related to competition between types. For instance, in the Lotka-Volterra competition model we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(n_1, n_2) &= r_1(1 - \alpha_{11}n_1 - \alpha_{12}n_2)n_1 \\ f_2(n_1, n_2) &= r_2(1 - \alpha_{22}n_1 - \alpha_{21}n_2)n_2 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $\alpha_{11} = 1/K_{11}$  and  $\alpha_{22} = 1/K_{22}$  measure competitive effects within types, while  $\alpha_{12} = 1/K_{12}$  and  $\alpha_{21} = 1/K_{21}$  measure competitive effects between types (Fig. 4a).

Thus, when MacArthur concludes that “fitness is  $K$ ” in crowded populations (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967, pp. 149), the meaning is that selection either favors the ability to keep growing at ever higher densities (moving a type’s own nullcline outwards), or the ability to suppress the growth of competitors at lower densities (moving the nullcline of competitors inwards) (Gill, 1974). This general idea is much broader than “ $K$ -selection” in the sense of selection for greater saturation density, and applies even if the nullclines are nonlinear to such an extent that the “ $K$ ” values themselves do not give much information about the regions of high-density growth.

It is obvious from Eq. (9) that selection can favor a superior competitor in a crowded population even if its saturation density is the same as, or lower than that of the other types present. However, the Lotka-Volterra model still couples selection to population density (Smouse, 1976). Fig. 4a shows Lotka-Volterra selection between two types with the same saturation density ( $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{22}$ ,  $\alpha_{21} > \alpha_{12}$ ). Even though the initial and final densities of a sweep are the same, density is not constant over a sweep. Only a highly restricted subset of  $r$  and  $\alpha$  values will keep  $N$  constant over a selective sweep (further details in Appendix C). Intuitively, for one type to exclude another with the same saturation density, competitive suppression of growth between types must be stronger than competitive suppression of growth within types, causing a dip in  $N$  over the sweep.




Figure 4: Selection between types with identical saturation density but different inter-type competitive ability. (a) Lotka-Volterra competition (Eq. 9) with  $r_1 = r_2 = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{22} = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{12} = 0.9$  and  $\alpha_{21} = 1.2$ . Trajectories do not follow the line  $N = K_{11} = K_{22}$ . (b) Lottery competition (Eq. 5) with  $b_1 = b_2 = 5$ ,  $d_1 = d_2 = 0.1$  and  $c_1/c_2 = 5$ . Trajectories converge on the line  $N = K_{11} = K_{22}$ .



By contrast, if one type in our density-dependent lottery model has a  $c$  advantage but the types are otherwise identical (so that each type has the same saturation density), the density trajectories converge on the line of constant density equal to the saturation density (Fig. 4b). Selection then occurs purely along this line, similarly to Fig. 1b. This occurs because  $c$  does not directly affect  $N$ : it only affects the relative likelihood for each type to win a contested territory, not whether a territory is contested in the first place (this can be seen formally in Eq. (7)). In other words, once the population reaches demographic equilibrium, it behaves indistinguishably from a constant- $N$  relative fitness model. While quite different from classical growth models like the Lotka-Volterra, this is all perfectly consistent with MacArthur’s general argument.

The constant- $N$  behavior of  $c$ -selection arises from the role of  $c$  as a trait determining relative competitive success in territorial contests. As such, this behavior is a result of a reproductive excesses Eq. (1). By contrast, previous models of selection-independent density either used unusual models of competition (Kimura and Crow, 1969; Nei, 1971), or made restrictive parameter choices in the Lotka-Volterra model (Appendix C; Smouse 1976; Mallet 2012).

## Density-regulating traits and the threat of strong selection

In the previous section we showed that  $c$ -selection and the regulation of population density are independent even though population growth is density-regulated in our variable-density lottery. Nevertheless, selection and density regulation *are* intimately connected in widely used models of population growth, as well as for the lottery  $b$  and  $d$  traits.

To see why this connection potentially poses a threat to relative fitness, consider the simple birth-death model (Kostitzin, 1939, pp. 20) (Travis et al., 2013)

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = (b_i - \delta_i N)n_i \tag{10}$$

where  $\delta_i$  is the per-capita increase in mortality rate due to crowding (for simplicity, there are no deaths when uncrowded), playing a similar role as  $K$  in the logistic model.

Starting from a monomorphic population, the frequency of a  $\delta_i \rightarrow \delta_i(1 - \epsilon)$  variant obeys

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \epsilon \delta_i N p_i (1 - p_i). \quad (11)$$

The selection coefficient  $s = \epsilon \delta_i N$  thus depends on density (compare with Model III in Kimura and Crow (1969)). On the other hand, the frequency of a  $b_i \rightarrow b_i(1 + \epsilon)$  variant will exactly obey Eq. (1) with  $s = \epsilon b_i$ , independent of density.

In practice the density dependence in Eq. (11) only matters if  $N$  changes substantially during a sweep. This can easily occur if a population is far from demographic equilibrium (we return to this scenario in the Discussion). However, even if  $N$  has reached equilibrium, it will change substantially over a  $\delta$ -sweep if selection on  $\delta$  is sufficiently strong. To quantify this effect, we need to account for how much  $N$  changes as a result of a  $\delta$ -sweep beginning and ending in equilibrium (Kimura and Crow, 1969); from Eq. (10) we have an increase from  $N_{\text{initial}} = b_i/\delta_i$  to  $N_{\text{final}} = b_i/\delta_i(1 - \epsilon) = N_{\text{initial}}/(1 - \epsilon)$ . The corresponding selection coefficient increases from  $s_{\text{initial}} = \epsilon b_i$  to  $s_{\text{final}} = s_{\text{initial}}/(1 - \epsilon)$ . Consequently, noticeable deviations from Eq. (1) occur with proportional changes to  $\delta$  of order  $\epsilon = 0.2$  and upwards i.e. selection must be quite strong (Fig. 5).

Let us now turn to selection on  $b$  and  $d$  in our lottery model. Recall that  $m_i = b_i n_i U/T$ , and so  $L = M/U = \bar{b}N/T$  where  $\bar{b}$  is the population mean  $b$ . Thus, from Eq. (6) we have

$$\Delta n_i = \left( \frac{b_i}{\bar{b}} \frac{1 - e^{-\bar{b}N/T}}{N} (T - N) - d_i \right) n_i. \quad (12)$$

It can be seen that the mortality  $d$  is akin to the birth rate in Eq. (10), and so, while  $d$  does affect density, selection on  $d$  is density independent. Thus,  $d$  sweeps follow the canonical




Figure 5: (a) Proportional change in the selection coefficient over a “ $K$ -like” sweep for a type that experiences proportionally  $1 - \epsilon$  fewer deaths induced by crowding. The population is in demographic equilibrium at the start and end of the sweep. (b) Example equilibrium-to-equilibrium  $\delta$ -sweep (Eq. 11) for  $\epsilon = 0.2$  showing a noticeable deviation from the canonical selection equation.

relative fitness model exactly (Fig. 6).

At first glance,  $b$  in Eq. (12) appears to be analogous to the  $\delta$  in Eq. (10) because it regulates density and is multiplied by the density-dependent term  $f(\bar{b}, N) = \frac{1-e^{-\bar{b}N/T}}{N}(T-N)$ . This term declines from  $\bar{b}$  at low density to zero at high density and as a result, selection on  $b$  is density-dependent. The source of this density-dependence is that the selective advantage from having greater  $b$  depends on the number of territories being contested; if almost all are occupied, then there is little advantage to having a greater  $b$ .

Nevertheless, the behavior of equilibrium-to-equilibrium  $b$ -sweeps are qualitatively different from the  $\delta$  sweeps above. The reason is that  $b$  regulates density by controlling how many unoccupied territories receive propagules. Thus, greater  $b$  means more propagules contesting territories, but also more territories being contested. The net effect on  $f(\bar{b}, N)$  is precisely zero in equilibrium: in a single-type equilibrium we have  $b_i/\bar{b} = 1$  and so  $f(\bar{b}, N) = d_i$  exactly at the beginning and end of a pure  $b$  sweep, even though the density  $N$  increases. Strictly speaking there is some deviation in  $f(N)$  from  $d_i$  during the sweep, but this deviation is an order of magnitude smaller than for a  $\delta$  sweep (the deviation due to a sweep with proportional effect  $b_i \rightarrow b_i(1+\epsilon)$  is only of order  $\epsilon^2$ , whereas the analogous effect in Fig. 5 is of order  $\epsilon$ ; see Appendix D for details). Since selection must already be quite strong for a  $\delta$  sweep to threaten Eq. (1), we conclude that  $b$  sweeps also obey the canonical selection equation (to a close approximation).

## Discussion

Summarizing the three traits in the variable-density lottery model: (i)  $c$ -selection is density-dependent, but  $c$  does not regulate density; (ii)  $d$  regulates density, but  $d$ -selection is density-independent; (iii)  $b$  regulates density and  $b$ -selection is density-dependent. Despite these differences, pure  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  sweeps starting and ending at equilibrium all obey the canonical




Figure 6: The density-dependence of selection in our variable-density lottery plotted as the selection coefficient  $(\Delta n_j - \Delta n_i)/n_j$  experienced by an adaptive variant  $j$  present at the same frequency as a wildtype  $i$ . Here  $b_i = 1$ ,  $d_i = 0.5$  and  $c_i = 1$ . For  $b$ -selection we set  $b_j = b_i(1 + \epsilon)$ , and similarly for  $c$  and  $d$ , with  $\epsilon = 0.1$ .  $d$ -selection is density-independent,  $b$ -selection gets weaker with lower territorial availability, while  $c$ -selection initially increases with density as territorial contests become more important, but eventually also declines as available territories become scarce. The equilibrium density for the  $i$  type is  $\approx 0.4$ .

selection equation. This rich variety of behaviors in relation to density is quite different from that found in the classical density-dependent selection literature (Roughgarden, 1979; Christiansen, 2004).

To briefly review: based on a diploid, bi-allelic variant of the logistic model, the  $r/K$  scheme proposed a dichotomy between  $r$ -selection (uncrowded) and  $K$ -selection (crowded) (MacArthur, 1962), with the latter taken to mean selection for greater saturation density (Gill, 1974). A more general Lotka-Volterra model introduces the inter-type  $\alpha_{ij}$  competition coefficients, with selection on these termed “ $\alpha$ -selection” (Gill, 1974; Joshi et al., 2001). Setting aside  $r$  which confers no selective advantage at equilibrium, we are left with  $K$  and  $\alpha$ , which both behave like  $\delta$  in that they are density-dependent and cause density to change over a sweep (although  $N$  only dips temporarily during an  $\alpha$ -sweep). Thus, strong selection is sufficient for relative fitness to break down in the classical view of density-dependent selection. Indeed, in the defense of Eq. (1) given by Kimura and Crow (1969), it was necessary to assume that  $s$  will be a few percent at most.

Our variable-density lottery model shows that it is not simply a lack of ecological realism that underlies the contrast between relative fitness with the classical view of density-dependent selection. Rather, in many population growth models, only one life-history stage is represented, and the competitive effects resulting from crowding appear as a reduction in absolute fitness that only depends on the type densities at this life-history stage (e.g. the  $n_i^2$  and  $n_i n_j$  terms in the Lotka Volterra equation). As noted in the introduction, this precludes selection concentrated at a fragile juvenile stage as a result of a reproductive excess (Chesson, 1983; Turner and Williamson, 1968; Kimura and Crow, 1969; Nei, 1971).

Reproductive excesses appear in the variable-density lottery model when the number of propagules is greater than the number of available territories. Then only  $\approx 1/L$  of the juveniles contesting available territories survive to adulthood. Unlike the role of adult density  $n_i$  in single-life-stage models, it is the propagule densities  $l_i$  that represent the crowding

that drives competition (a “critical age-group”; Charlesworth 1994, pp. 54). In general, reproductive excesses will tend to produce strictly-relative lottery-type contests in which fitter types grow at the expense of others by preferentially filling the available adult “slots”. The number of slots can remain fixed or change independently of selection at the juvenile stage. By ignoring reproductive excesses, single life-stage models are biased to have total population density be sensitive to ongoing selection. In this respect, the Wright-Fisher model and similar viability selection heuristics actually capture an important ecological process.

We now turn to the breakdown of Eq. (1). We first discuss the problem shown in Fig. 5, which occurs when strong selection changes population density and is also density-dependent. In the variable-density lottery, this occurs if and only if types differ in more than one trait. The  $c$  and  $d$  traits represent the two distinct directions in which density and selection interact: selection may depend on density, and density may depend on selection (Prout, 1980). The combination is necessary to pose a threat to Eq. (1). However, the  $b$  trait remarkably demonstrates that the combination is not sufficient, since the density-dependence of  $b$ -selection disappears over equilibrium-to-equilibrium  $b$ -sweeps. Thus, the simple linear models that have become standard in discussions of density-dependent selection (Roughgarden, 1979; Christiansen, 2004; Mallet, 2012; Travis et al., 2013) actually represent a complicated form of the interaction between density and selection, and their parameters confound the underlying issues.

While this is a conceptual reason to be wary of the classical density-dependent selection models, it is not clear how we should expect the trait variation in nature to align. For instance, should we expect mutations to generally affect  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  independently of each other, or pleiotropically such that  $\delta$ -like selection is prevalent? In the case of well-mixed indirect exploitation competition for consumable resources, the  $R^*$  rule suggests that  $\delta$ -like selection will be prevalent. However, for many populations consumable resources are not well-mixed. Spatial localization of consumable resources (e.g. due to restricted movement of

nutrients through soils) will tend to create a territorial situation similar to the lottery model, where resource competition only occurs locally and both it and any interference competition are subsumed into the competitive ability  $c$ , which does not affect  $N$ .

Relative fitness models truly break down when  $N$  is far from equilibrium and selection is density-dependent (as seems likely; Travis et al. 2013). For example, wild *Drosophila* experience large seasonal boom-bust cycles in population density coupled to strong selection that drives large swings in allele frequency (Bergland et al., 2014). In this case there is no choice but to abandon relative fitness, and our model provides one potentially suitable option. Whether or not our density-dependent lottery model is a good description of *Drosophila* ecology, the close connection between our model and Wright-Fisher is useful, because drift in our model should behave broadly similarly. Thus, our model should provide a useful starting point for analyzing evolution in this and other far-from-equilibrium situations.

Another issue with the constant- $N$  relative fitness description of selection is that it precludes consideration of longer-term aspects of the interplay between evolution and ecology such as population extinction. A variety of approaches have been developed for dealing with these issues in quantitative genetics (Burger and Lynch, 1995; Engen et al., 2013), population genetics (Bertram et al., 2017) and adaptive dynamics (Ferriere and Legendre, 2013; Dieckmann and Ferrière, 2004). Although density-dependent selection is pertinent to these longer-term issues (Travis et al., 2013), our focus here has been the description of the time-dependent process by which selection changes allele frequencies. This is particularly critical for making sense of evolution at the genetic level, for which we now have abundant data.

## References

- N. Arenbaev. Asymptotic behavior of the multinomial distribution. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 21(4):805–810, 1977.



- 402 N. Barton, D. Briggs, J. Eisen, D. Goldstein, and N. Patel. *Evolution*. NY: Cold Spring  
403 Harbor Laboratory Press, 2007.
- 404 T. Benton and A. Grant. Evolutionary fitness in ecology: comparing measures of fitness in  
405 stochastic, density-dependent environments. *Evolutionary ecology research*, 2(6):769–789,  
406 2000.
- 407 A. O. Bergland, E. L. Behrman, K. R. O’Brien, P. S. Schmidt, and D. A. Petrov. Genomic  
408 evidence of rapid and stable adaptive oscillations over seasonal time scales in drosophila.  
409 *PLOS Genetics*, 10(11):1–19, 11 2014. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1004775.
- 410 J. Bertram, K. Gomez, and J. Masel. Predicting patterns of long-term adaptation and  
411 extinction with population genetics. *Evolution*, 71(2):204–214, 2017.
- 412 B. M. Bolker and S. W. Pacala. Spatial moment equations for plant competition: Under-  
413 standing spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal. *The American Naturalist*,  
414 153(6):575–602, 1999. doi: 10.1086/303199.
- 415 R. Burger and M. Lynch. Evolution and extinction in a changing environment: a  
416 quantitative-genetic analysis. *Evolution*, pages 151–163, 1995.
- 417 B. Charlesworth. *Evolution in age-structured populations*, volume 2. Cambridge University  
418 Press Cambridge, 1994.
- 419 P. L. Chesson. *Coexistence of Competitors in a Stochastic Environment: The Storage Effect*,  
420 pages 188–198. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1983. ISBN 978-3-642-  
421 87893-0.
- 422 P. L. Chesson and R. R. Warner. Environmental variability promotes coexistence in lottery  
423 competitive systems. *American Naturalist*, pages 923–943, 1981.

424 F. Christiansen. Density dependent selection. In *Evolution of Population Biology: Modern*  
425 *Synthesis*, pages 139–155. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

426 J. F. Crow, M. Kimura, et al. An introduction to population genetics theory. *An introduction*  
427 *to population genetics theory.*, 1970.

428 U. Dieckmann and R. Ferrière. Adaptive dynamics and evolving biodiversity. 2004.

429 M. Doebeli, Y. Ispolatov, and B. Simon. Towards a mechanistic foundation of evolutionary  
430 theory. *eLife*, 6:e23804, feb 2017. ISSN 2050-084X. doi: 10.7554/eLife.23804.

431 S. Engen, R. Lande, B.-E. Sther, A. E. A. Gardner, and E. T. Day. A quantita-  
432 tive genetic model of  $\text{jem}_i r_i / \text{em}_i$ - and  $\text{jem}_i k_i / \text{em}_i$ -selection in a fluctuating popula-  
433 tion. *The American Naturalist*, 181(6):725–736, 2013. ISSN 00030147, 15375323. URL  
434 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/670257>.

435 W. J. Ewens. *Mathematical Population Genetics 1: Theoretical Introduction*. Springer  
436 Science & Business Media, 2004.

437 R. Ferriere and S. Legendre. Eco-evolutionary feedbacks, adaptive dynamics and evolutionary  
438 rescue theory. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 368(1610):20120081, 2013.

439 D. E. Gill. Intrinsic rate of increase, saturation density, and competitive ability. ii. the  
440 evolution of competitive ability. *American Naturalist*, 108:103–116, 1974.

441 J. P. Grover. *Resource competition*, volume 19. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.

442 A. Joshi, N. Prasad, and M. Shakarad. K-selection,  $\alpha$ -selection, effectiveness, and tolerance  
443 in competition: density-dependent selection revisited. *Journal of Genetics*, 80(2):63–75,  
444 2001.

- 445 M. Kimura and J. F. Crow. Natural selection and gene substitution. *Genetics Research*, 13  
446 (2):127–141, 1969.
- 447 V. A. Kostitzin. *Mathematical biology*. George G. Harrap And Company Ltd.; London, 1939.
- 448 R. Levins and D. Culver. Regional coexistence of species and competition between rare  
449 species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 68(6):1246–1248, 1971.
- 450 R. H. MacArthur. Some generalized theorems of natural selection. *Proceedings of the National*  
451 *Academy of Sciences*, 48(11):1893–1897, 1962.
- 452 R. H. MacArthur and E. O. Wilson. *Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University  
453 Press, 1967.
- 454 J. Mallet. The struggle for existence. how the notion of carrying capacity,  $k$ , obscures the  
455 links between demography, darwinian evolution and speciation. 2012.
- 456 P. W. Messer, S. P. Ellner, and N. G. Hairston. Can population genetics adapt to rapid  
457 evolution? *Trends in Genetics*, 32(7):408–418, 2016.
- 458 C. J. E. Metcalf and S. Pavard. Why evolutionary biologists should be demographers.  
459 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 22(4):205 – 212, 2007. ISSN 0169-5347. doi:  
460 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.12.001>.
- 461 J. A. Metz, R. M. Nisbet, and S. A. Geritz. How should we define fitness for general ecological  
462 scenarios? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 7(6):198–202, 1992.
- 463 M. Nei. Fertility excess necessary for gene substitution in regulated populations. *Genetics*,  
464 68(1):169, 1971.
- 465 T. Prout. Some relationships between density-independent selection and density-dependent  
466 population growth. *Evol. Biol*, 13:1–68, 1980.

J. Roughgarden. Theory of population genetics and evolutionary ecology: an introduction.  
1979.

P. F. Sale. Maintenance of high diversity in coral reef fish communities. *The American Naturalist*, 111(978):337–359, 1977.

P. E. Smouse. The implications of density-dependent population growth for frequency-and density-dependent selection. *The American Naturalist*, 110(975):849–860, 1976.

H. Svardal, C. Rueffler, and J. Hermisson. A general condition for adaptive genetic polymorphism in temporally and spatially heterogeneous environments. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 99:76 – 97, 2015. ISSN 0040-5809. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tpb.2014.11.002>.

D. Tilman. Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology*, 75(1): 2–16, 1994.

J. Travis, J. Leips, and F. H. Rodd. Evolution in population parameters: Density-dependent selection or density-dependent fitness? *The American Naturalist*, 181(S1):S9–S20, 2013. doi: 10.1086/669970.

J. Turner and M. Williamson. Population size, natural selection and the genetic load. *Nature*, 218(5142):700–700, 1968.

G. P. Wagner. The measurement theory of fitness. *Evolution*, 64(5):1358–1376, 2010.

## Appendix A: Poisson approximation

For simplicity of presentation, we have assumed a Poisson distribution for the  $x_i$  as our model of dispersal. Strictly speaking, the total number of  $i$  propagules  $\sum x_i$  (summed over unoccupied territories) is then no longer a constant  $m_i$ , but fluctuates between generations

for a given mean  $m_i$ , which is more biologically realistic. Nevertheless, since we do not consider the random fluctuations in type abundances here, and for ease of comparison with the classic lottery model, we ignore the fluctuations in  $m_i$ . Instead we focus, on Poisson fluctuations in propagule composition in each territory.

In the exact model of random dispersal, the counts of a type's propagules across unoccupied territories follows a multinomial distribution with dimension  $U$ , total number of trials equal to  $m_i$ , and equal probabilities  $1/U$  for a propagule to land in a given territory. Thus, the  $x_i$  in different territories are not independent random variables. However, for sufficiently large  $U$  and  $m_i$ , this multinomial distribution for the  $x_i$  across territories is closely approximated by a product of independent Poisson distributions for each territory, each with rate parameter  $l_i$  (Arenbaev, 1977, Theorem 1). Since we are ignoring finite population size effects, we effectively have  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , in which case  $U$  can only be small enough to violate the Poisson approximation if there is vanishing population turnover, and then the dispersal distribution is irrelevant anyway. Likewise, in ignoring stochastic finite population size for the  $n_i$ , we have effectively already assumed that  $m_i$  is large enough to justify the Poisson approximation (the error scales as  $1/\sqrt{m_i}$ ; Arenbaev 1977).

## Appendix B: Derivation of growth equation

We separate the right hand side of Eq. (2) into three components  $\Delta_+ n_i = \Delta_u n_i + \Delta_r n_i + \Delta_a n_i$  which vary in relative magnitude depending on the propagule densities  $l_i$ . Following the notation in the main text, the Poisson distributions for the  $x_i$  (or some subset of the  $x_i$ ) will be denoted  $p$ , and we use  $P$  as a general shorthand for the probability of particular outcomes.

## 510 Growth without competition

511 The first component,  $\Delta_u n_i$ , accounts for territories where only one focal propagule is present  
 512  $x_i = 1$  and  $x_j = 0$  for  $j \neq i$  ( $u$  stands for “uncontested”). The proportion of territories where  
 513 this occurs is  $l_i e^{-L}$ , and so

$$\Delta_u n_i = U l_i e^{-L} = m_i e^{-L}. \quad (13)$$

## 514 Competition when rare

515 The second component,  $\Delta_r n_i$ , accounts for territories where a single focal propagule is present  
 516 along with at least one non-focal propagule ( $r$  stands for “rare”) i.e.  $x_i = 1$  and  $X_i \geq 1$   
 517 where  $X_i = \sum_{j \neq i} x_j$  is the number of nonfocal propagules. The number of territories where  
 518 this occurs is  $U p_i(1) P(X_i \geq 1) = b_i n_i e^{-l_i} (1 - e^{-(L-l_i)})$ . Thus

$$\Delta_r n_i = m_i e^{-l_i} (1 - e^{-(L-l_i)}) \left\langle \frac{c_i}{c_i + \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j} \right\rangle_{\tilde{p}}, \quad (14)$$

519 where  $\langle \rangle_{\tilde{p}}$  denotes the expectation with respect to  $\tilde{p}$ , and  $\tilde{p}$  is the probability distribution  
 520 of nonfocal propagule abundances  $x_j$  *after* dispersal (the significance of evaluating after  
 521 dispersal should become clearer below), in those territories where exactly one focal propagule,  
 522 and at least one non-focal propagule, landed.

523 Our approximation is to replace  $x_j$  with its mean in the last term in Eq. (14),

$$\left\langle \frac{c_i}{c_i + \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j} \right\rangle_{\tilde{p}} \approx \frac{c_i}{c_i + \sum_{j \neq i} c_j \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}}}. \quad (15)$$

524 Below we justify this replacement by arguing that the standard deviation  $\sigma_{\tilde{p}}(\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j)$   
 525 (with respect to  $\tilde{p}$ ), is much smaller than  $\langle \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}}$ . If this standard deviation is small  
 526 as claimed, then the mean value gives an accurate representation of the values taken by  
 527  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$  across territories.

528 We first calculate  $\langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}}$ . Let  $X = \sum_j x_j$  denote the total number of propagules in a  
 529 territory and  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_G)$  denote the vector of non-focal abundances, so  
 530 that  $p(\mathbf{x}_i) = p_1(x_1) \cdots p_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) p_{i+1}(x_{i+1}) \cdots p_G(x_G)$ . Then,  $\tilde{p}$  is the probability distribution  
 531 for  $\mathbf{x}_i$  conditional on the territory having received  $X \geq 2$  propagules, where  $X_i = X - 1$  of  
 532 them are nonfocal, giving

$$\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{X=2}^{\infty} P(X|X \geq 2) p(\mathbf{x}_i|X_i = X - 1) \quad (16)$$

Here the total number of propagules  $X$  follows a Poisson distribution with mean  $L$ , and we have  $P(X|X \geq 2) = P(X)/P(X \geq 2) = P(X)/(1 - (1 + L)e^{-L})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i} \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}_i) x_j \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - (1 + L)e^{-L}} \sum_{X=2}^{\infty} P(X) \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i} p(\mathbf{x}_i|X_i = X - 1) x_j. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The inner sum over  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the mean number of propagules of a given nonfocal type  $j$  that will be found in a territory which received  $X - 1$  nonfocal propagules in total, which is equal to  $\frac{l_j}{L - l_i}(X - 1)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}} &= \frac{l_j}{1 - (1 + L)e^{-L}} \frac{1}{L - l_i} \sum_{X=2}^{\infty} P(X)(X - 1) \\ &= \frac{l_j}{1 - (1 + L)e^{-L}} \frac{L - 1 + e^{-L}}{L - l_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

533 where the last line follows from  $\sum_{X=2}^{\infty} P(X)(X - 1) = \sum_{X=1}^{\infty} P(X)(X - 1) = \sum_{X=1}^{\infty} P(X)X -$   
 534  $\sum_{X=1}^{\infty} P(X)$ .

Having evaluated the mean propagule numbers, we now evaluate the variance in propagule numbers to check that the mean value replacement in Eq. (15) is justified. This is complicated because the  $x_j$  are not independent with respect to  $\tilde{p}$ . Here we use the following

approximation to give some insight into the magnitude of these fluctuations and also the nature of the correlations between the  $x_j$ . We replace  $\tilde{p}$  with  $\tilde{q}$ , defined as the  $\mathbf{x}_i$  Poisson dispersal probabilities conditional on  $X_i \geq 1$  (which are independent). The distinction between  $\tilde{p}$  and  $\tilde{q}$  will be discussed further below. The  $\tilde{q}$  approximation gives  $\langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{q}} = \langle x_j \rangle_p / C = l_j / C$ , where  $C = 1 - e^{-(L-l_i)}$ , with variances and covariances given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\tilde{q}}^2(x_j) &= \langle x_j^2 \rangle_{\tilde{q}} - \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{q}}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{C} \langle x_j^2 \rangle_p - \frac{l_j^2}{C^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{C} (l_j^2 + l_j) - \frac{l_j^2}{C^2} \\
&= \frac{l_j^2}{C} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{C} \right) + \frac{l_j}{C},
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\tilde{q}}(x_j, x_k) &= \langle x_j x_k \rangle_{\tilde{q}} - \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{q}} \langle x_k \rangle_{\tilde{q}} \\
&= \frac{1}{C} \langle x_j x_k \rangle_p - \frac{l_j l_k}{C^2} \\
&= \frac{l_j l_k}{C} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{C} \right) \quad j \neq k.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

535 The distinction between  $\tilde{p}$  and  $\tilde{q}$  is closely connected to why the exact dispersal probability  
536 distribution  $\tilde{p}$  is evaluated *after* dispersal.  $\tilde{p}$  assumes that one of the propagules present  
537 in a given territory after dispersal belongs to the focal type (a statement about propagule  
538 identity), whereas  $\tilde{q}$  assumes that there is a focal propagule present before non-focal dis-  
539 persal commences (a statement about propagule presence). As a result, if the focal type  
540 is rare,  $\tilde{q}$  predicts that the mean propagule density is  $L + 1$  in territories with one focal  
541 propagule. This is erroneous, because the mean number of propagules per territory when  
542 lottery competition commences is  $L$ , regardless of whether a focal propagule happens to be



present. The discrepancy causes rare invaders evaluated under  $\tilde{q}$  to have an intrinsic rarity disadvantage, which is absurd (i.e. even if  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  are identical,  $\tilde{q}$  predicts that a rare type will decline in frequency). By contrast, Eq. (18) correctly predicts that there are on average  $\sum_{j \neq i} \langle x_j \rangle_{\tilde{p}} \approx L - 1$  nonfocal propagules because  $\tilde{p}$  accounts for potentially large negative covariances between the  $x_j$  “after dispersal”. By neglecting the latter covariances,  $\tilde{q}$  overestimates the fluctuations in  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$ ; thus  $\tilde{q}$  gives an upper bound on the fluctuations. The discrepancy between  $\tilde{q}$  and  $\tilde{p}$  will be largest when  $L$  is of order 1 or smaller, because then the propagule assumed to already be present under  $\tilde{q}$  is comparable to, or greater than, the entire propagule density.

Decomposing the variance in  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$ ,

$$\sigma_{\tilde{q}}^2\left(\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j\right) = \sum_{j \neq i} \left[ c_j^2 \sigma_{\tilde{q}}^2(x_j) + 2 \sum_{k > j, k \neq i} c_j c_k \sigma_{\tilde{q}}(x_j, x_k) \right], \quad (21)$$

and using the fact that  $\sigma_{\tilde{q}}(x_j, x_k)$  and the first term in Eq. (19) are negative because  $C < 1$ , we obtain an upper bound on the relative fluctuations in  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$ ,

$$\frac{\sigma(\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j)}{\langle \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j \rangle} = C^{1/2} \frac{\left( \sum_{j \neq i} c_j^2 l_j + (1 - 1/C) \left( \sum_{j \neq i} c_j l_j \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}}{\sum_{j \neq i} c_j l_j} < C^{1/2} \frac{\left( \sum_{j \neq i} c_j^2 l_j \right)^{1/2}}{\sum_{j \neq i} c_j l_j}. \quad (22)$$

Suppose that the  $c_j$  are all of similar magnitude (their ratios are of order one). Then Eq. (22) is  $\ll 1$  for the case when  $L - l_i \ll 1$  (due to the factor of  $C^{1/2}$ ), and also for the case when at least some of the nonfocal propagule densities are large  $l_j \gg 1$  (since it is then of order  $1/\sqrt{L - l_i}$ ). The worst case scenario occurs when  $L - l_i$  is of order one. Then Eq. (22) gives a relative error of approximately 50%, which from our earlier discussion we know to be a substantial overestimate when  $L$  is of order 1. Our numerical results (Fig. 3) confirm that the relative errors are indeed small.

However, the relative fluctuations in  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$  can be large if some of the  $c_j$  are much

larger than the others. Specifically, in the presence of a rare, extremely strong competitor ( $c_j l_j \gg c_{j'} l_{j'}$  for all other nonfocal types  $j'$ , and  $l_j \ll 1$ ), then the RHS of Eq. (22) can be large and we cannot make the replacement Eq. (15).

Substituting Eqs. (15) and (18) into Eq. (14), we obtain

$$\Delta_r n_i \approx m_i R_i \frac{c_i}{\bar{c}}, \quad (23)$$

where  $R_i$  is defined in Eq. (6).

## Competition when abundant

The final contribution,  $\Delta_a n_i$ , accounts for territories where two or more focal propagules are present ( $a$  stands for “abundant”). Similarly to Eq. (14), we have

$$\Delta_a n_i = U(1 - (1 + l_i)e^{l_i}) \left\langle \frac{c_i x_i}{\sum_j c_j x_j} \right\rangle_{\hat{p}} \quad (24)$$

where  $\hat{p}$  is the probability distribution of both focal and nonfocal propagule abundances *after* dispersal in those territories where at least two focal propagules landed.

Again, we argue that the relative fluctuations in  $\sum c_j x_j$  are much smaller than 1 (with respect to  $\hat{p}$ ), so that,

$$\left\langle \frac{c_i x_i}{\sum_j c_j x_j} \right\rangle_{\hat{p}} \approx \frac{c_i \langle x_i \rangle_{\hat{p}}}{\sum_j c_j \langle x_j \rangle_{\hat{p}}}. \quad (25)$$

Following a similar procedure as for  $\Delta_r n_i$ , where the vector of propagule abundances is

denoted  $\mathbf{x}$ , the mean focal type abundance is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x_i \rangle_{\hat{p}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} x_i p(\mathbf{x} | x_i \geq 2) \\
&= \sum_{x_i} x_i p(x_i | x_i \geq 2) \\
&= \frac{1}{1 - (1 + l_i)e^{-l_i}} \sum_{x_i \geq 2} p(x_i) x_i \\
&= l_i \frac{1 - e^{-l_i}}{1 - (1 + l_i)e^{-l_i}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

For nonfocal types  $j \neq i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x_j \rangle_{\hat{p}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} x_j p(\mathbf{x} | x_i \geq 2) \\
&= \sum_X P(X | x_i \geq 2) \sum_{\mathbf{x}} x_j p(\mathbf{x} | x_i \geq 2, X) \\
&= \sum_X P(X | x_i \geq 2) \sum_{x_i} p(x_i | x_i \geq 2, X) \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i} x_j p(\mathbf{x}_i | X_i = X - x_i) \\
&= \sum_X P(X | x_i \geq 2) \sum_{x_i} p(x_i | x_i \geq 2, X) \frac{l_j(X - x_i)}{L - l_i} \\
&= \frac{l_j}{L - l_i} \left[ \sum_X P(X | x_i \geq 2) X - \sum_{x_i} p(x_i | x_i \geq 2) x_i \right] \\
&= \frac{l_j}{L - l_i} \left( L \frac{1 - e^{-L}}{1 - (1 + L)e^{-L}} - l_i \frac{1 - e^{-l_i}}{1 - (1 + l_i)e^{-l_i}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

575 In going from line 3 to 4, we used the same logic used to evaluate the inner sum in Eq. (17),  
576 and in going from 4 to 5 we have separately evaluated the contributions from the  $X$  and  $x_i$   
577 terms in the numerator.

578 To calculate the standard deviation in  $\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$ , we use a similar approximation as  
579 for  $\Delta_r n_i$ :  $\hat{p}$  is approximated by  $\hat{q}$ , defined as the  $\mathbf{x}$  dispersal probabilities in a territory  
580 conditional on  $x_i > 2$  (that is, treating the  $x_j$  as independent). All covariances between

nonfocal types are now zero, so that  $\sigma_{\hat{q}}^2(\sum c_j x_j) = \sum c_j^2 \sigma_{\hat{q}}^2(x_j)$ , where  $\sigma_{\hat{q}}^2(x_j) = l_j$  for  $j \neq i$ ,  
and

$$\sigma_{\hat{q}}^2(x_i) = \frac{l_i}{D} \left( l_i + 1 - e^{-l_i} - \frac{l_i}{D} (1 - e^{-l_i})^2 \right), \quad (28)$$

where  $D = 1 - (1 + l_i)e^{-l_i}$ , and

$$\frac{\sigma_{\hat{q}}(\sum c_j x_j)}{\langle \sum c_j x_j \rangle} = \frac{\left( \sum_{j \neq i} c_j^2 l_j + c_i^2 \sigma_{\hat{q}}^2(x_i) \right)^{1/2}}{\sum_{j \neq i} c_j l_j + c_i l_i (1 - e^{-l_i}) / D}. \quad (29)$$

Similarly to Eq. (22), the RHS of Eq. (29) is  $\ll 1$  for the case that  $L \ll 1$  (due to a factor of  $D^{1/2}$ ), and also for the case when at least some of the propagule densities (focal or nonfocal) are large — provided that  $c_i$  and the  $c_j$  are all of similar magnitude. Again, the worst case scenario occurs when  $l_i$  and  $L - l_i$  are of order 1, in which case Eq. (29) is around 35%, which is again where the  $\hat{q}$  approximation produces the biggest overestimate of the fluctuations in  $\mathbf{x}$ . Similarly to Eq. (22), the RHS of (29) will not be  $\ll 1$  in the presence of a rare, extremely strong competitor.

Combining Eqs. (24) and (25), we obtain

$$\Delta_a n_i = m_i A_i \frac{c_i}{\bar{c}}, \quad (30)$$

where  $A_i$  is defined in Eq. (6).

## Appendix C: Total density in the Lotka-Volterra competition model

Here we show that under the Lotka-Volterra model of competition, total density  $N$  does not in general remain constant over a selective sweep in a crowded population even if the types

597 have the same saturation density (for a related discussion on the density- and frequency-  
 598 dependence of selection in the Lotka-Volterra model, see (Smouse, 1976; Mallet, 2012)).

We assume equal effects of crowding within types  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{\text{intra}}$  and  $N = 1/\alpha_{\text{intra}}$  and check whether it is then possible for  $\frac{dN}{dt}$  to be zero in the sweep ( $n_1, n_2 \neq 0$ ). Substituting these conditions into Eq. (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dn_1}{dt} &= r_1(\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{12})n_1n_2 \\ \frac{dn_2}{dt} &= r_2(\alpha_{22} - \alpha_{21})n_1n_2\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

599 Adding these together,  $\frac{dN}{dt}$  can only be zero if

$$r_1(\alpha_{\text{intra}} - \alpha_{12}) + r_2(\alpha_{\text{intra}} - \alpha_{21}) = 0.\tag{32}$$

600 To get some intuition for Eq. (32), suppose that a mutant arises with improved competitive  
 601 ability but identical intrinsic growth rate and saturation density ( $r_1 = r_2$  and  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{22}$ ).  
 602 This could represent a mutation to an interference competition trait, for example (Gill,  
 603 1974). Then, according the above condition, for  $N$  to remain constant over the sweep, the  
 604 mutant must find the wildtype more tolerable than itself by exactly the same amount that  
 605 the wildtype finds the mutant less tolerable than itself.

606 Even if we persuaded ourselves that this balance of inter-type interactions is plausible  
 607 in some circumstances, when multiple types are present the requirement for constant  $N$   
 608 becomes

$$\sum_{ij} r_i(\alpha_{\text{intra}} - \alpha_{ij})p_i p_j = 0,\tag{33}$$

609 which depends on frequency and thus cannot be satisfied in general for constant inter-type  
 610 coefficients  $\alpha_{ij}$ . We conclude that selection in the Lotka-Volterra competition model will  
 611 generally involve non-constant  $N$ .

## 612 Appendix D: Density-dependence of $b$ -selection

613 In section “Density-regulating traits and the threat of strong selection” we argued that  
 614 the density-dependent factor  $f(\bar{b}, N)$  is unchanged at the beginning and end points of an  
 615 equilibrium-to-equilibrium  $b$ . Here we estimate the magnitude of the deviation in  $f(\bar{b}, N)$   
 616 during the sweep.

For simplicity, we introduce the notation  $D = N/T$  and assume that  $D$  is small. We can thus make the approximation  $1 - e^{-\bar{b}D} \approx \bar{b}D$  and  $f(\bar{b}, N) \approx \bar{b}(1 - D)$ . We expect this to be a conservative approximate based on the worst case scenario, because  $N$  is most sensitive to an increase in  $b$  in this low-density linear regime. We first calculate the value of  $f(\bar{b}, N)$  at the halfway point in a sweep, where the halfway point is estimated with simple linear averages for  $b$  and  $N$ . The sweep is driven by a  $b$  variant with  $b_j = b_i(1 + \epsilon)$ , and we denote the corresponding initial and final densities by  $D_i$  and  $D_j$  respectively, where we have  $d_i = b_i(1 - D_i) = b_j(1 - D_j)$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{half}} &= f\left(\frac{b_i + b_j}{2}, \frac{N_i + N_j}{2}\right) = \frac{b_i + b_j}{2} \left(1 - \frac{D_i + D_j}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(b_i + b_j)(2 - D_i - D_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(2d_i + b_i(1 - D_j) + b_j(1 - N_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Dividing by  $d_i$ , the proportional deviation in  $f(N)$  at the midpoint of the sweep is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f_{\text{half}}}{d_i} &= \frac{1}{4} \left(2 + \frac{b_i}{b_j} + \frac{b_j}{b_i}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(2 + \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} + 1 + \epsilon\right) \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{4}(\epsilon^2 - \epsilon^3 + \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

617 where we have used the Taylor expansion  $\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} = 1 - \epsilon + \epsilon^2 - \epsilon^3 + \dots$

618 By contrast, for a  $\delta$  sweep in Eq. (10), the density-dependent term  $N$  increases by a  
 619 factor of  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} = 1 + \epsilon + \epsilon^2 + \dots$ . Thus, the deviations in  $f(N)$  are an order of magnitude  
 620 smaller than those shown in Fig. (5), and even proportional changes of order  $\epsilon = 0.1$  will  
 621 cause a negligible deviation from the canonical selection equation.