System/Organism	Natural	Population	Selection	Beneficial	Regime	Estimated	Comment
70	/ Lab	size (N)	coeff.(s)	mut. rate (U)	0.5	mutation bias	
70 avian taxa; Hb-O2 affinity	natural	small to moderate	moderate	small because	OF	6 fold for	Excess of CpG adaptive mutations compared
adaptations to elevation			to large	few genes		mutations	to number predicted by null model where CpG
Storz et al. [16] De novo gene birth in	natural	lorgo	unknown	tiny	OF	> 465: 92 = 5	status irrelevant to adaptation Mutation bias greater if longer ORFs are more
overlapping reading frame in	Haturai	large	ulikilowii	tilly	because	2 403. 72 = 3	likely to be adaptive
80 capsid viral species					tiny <i>U</i>		likely to be adaptive
Willis & Masel [40]					tilly 0		
Meta-analysis of adaptive	natural	mixed	mixed	mixed	Mixed,	3 – 7 fold for	Excess transitions
mutations	& lab	IIIIXCu	IIIIACU	mixed	OF +	mutations,	Excess transitions
Stoltzfus & McCandlish [15]	G. 145				MM	2 – 4 fold for	
515112145 & 11105411411511 [25]						unique mutations	
M. tuberculosis; antibiotic	natural	large	large	small	OF or	1.6 – 41.6 fold	Excess transitions for 9 out of 11 different
resistance	clinical		100 fold	$10^{-9} - 10^{-7}$	MM	for mutations	antibiotics
Payne et el. [9]	isolates		increase in				
			MIC				
P. aeruginosa; antibiotic	lab	$10^4 - 10^9$	0.12	8.3×10^{-10}	OF or	Allele-specific	In 11 adaptive mutations, chances of evolving
resistance			-0.96	-2.5×10^{-8}	MM	mutation rate	correlated with respective mutation rates [10],
MacLean et al. [14]						varies by $30\mathrm{fold}$	and uncorrelated with selection coefficients
ssDNA bacteriophages ID8,	lab	$10^5 - 10^9$	0.11	1.1×10^{-3} –	OF or	24 fold for	Excess transitions
ID11, NC13, WA13; phage			-0.64	5.3×10^{-3}	MM	mutations,	
growth				(total mut. rate)		11 fold for unique	
Sackman et al. [12]						mutations	
ssDNA bacteriophage ID11;	lab	$10^4 - 10^8$	0.11	1.1×10^{-3} –	OF or	8-9 fold among	OF model used to estimate relative mutation
phage growth			- 0.39	5.3×10^{-3}	MM	relative mutation	rates. Ranking of s differs from [12].
Rokyta et al. [11]				(total mut. rate)		rates	
HIV-1; evolved in cultures of	lab	1×10^{3}	large	high	MM	5 fold for	Excess transitions
human T-cells		-6×10^{6}				mutations,	
Bertels et al. [39]						6 fold for unique	
						mutations	
E. coli; evolved with DHFR	lab	6×10^6	large	high	MM	unavailable	Mutations rewiring broken metabolic network
inhibited using antibiotic		-7.2×10^{8}					to less efficient configuration favored over
Schober et al. [37]		4.6407					those restoring original efficient configuration
E. coli; adaptation following	lab	1.6×10^7	large	small	MM	unavailable	Mutations rewiring broken metabolic network
inactivation of DHFR		-4.8×10^{7}					to less efficient configuration favored over
Rodrigues et al. [38]	1-1	72 ~ 407		L: 1	N 4 N 4	100 200 () !	those restoring original efficient configuration
E. coli; antibiotic resistance	lab	7.2×10^7	large	high 3×10^{-4}	MM or	100 – 300 fold	Different mutational profiles of ΔmutT
Couce et al. [13]		-3.6×10^9	0.00158		DM	$(\Delta mutH)$,	(elevates transversions, excl. usual transition
			-1	-1×10^{-2}		500 – 10,000 fold	adaptations) v. $\Delta mutH$ (elevates transitions)
						$(\Delta mutT)$	