

# MUTATION, MIGRATION, AND GENETIC DRIFT

## Introduction

So far in this course we've focused on single, isolated populations, and we've imagined that there isn't any mutation. We've also completely ignored the ultimate source of all genetic variation—mutation. We're now going to study what happens when we consider multiple populations simultaneously and when we allow mutation to happen. Let's consider mutation first.

## Drift and mutation

Remember that in the absence of mutation

$$f_{t+1} = \left(\frac{1}{2N}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2N}\right) f_t \quad , \quad (1)$$

One way of modeling mutation is to assume that every time a mutation occurs it introduces a new allele into the population. This model is referred to as the *infinite alleles model*, because it implicitly assumes that there is potentially an infinite number of alleles. Under this model we need to make only one simple modification to equation (1). We have to multiply the expression on the right by the probability that neither allele mutated:

$$f_{t+1} = \left(\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2N}\right) f_t\right) (1 - \mu)^2 \quad , \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu$  is the mutation rate, i.e., the probability that an allele in an offspring is different from the allele it was derived from in a parent.

So where do we go from here? Well, if you think about it, mutation is always introducing new alleles that, by definition, are different from any of the alleles currently in the population. It stands to reason, therefore, that we'll never be in a situation where all of the alleles in a population are identical by descent as they would be in the absence of mutation. In other

words we expect there to be an equilibrium between loss of diversity through genetic drift and the introduction of diversity through mutation.<sup>1</sup> From the definition of an equilibrium,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{f} &= \left( \left( \frac{1}{2N} \right) + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} \right) \hat{f} \right) (1 - \mu)^2 \\
 \hat{f} \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} \right) (1 - \mu)^2 \right) &= \left( \frac{1}{2N} \right) (1 - \mu)^2 \\
 \hat{f} &= \frac{\left( \frac{1}{2N} \right) (1 - \mu)^2}{1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} \right) (1 - \mu)^2} \\
 &\approx \frac{1 - 2\mu}{2N \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} \right) (1 - 2\mu) \right)} \\
 &= \frac{1 - 2\mu}{2N \left( 1 - 1 + \frac{1}{2N} + 2\mu - \frac{2\mu}{2N} \right)} \\
 &= \frac{1 - 2\mu}{1 + 4N\mu - 2\mu} \\
 &\approx \frac{1}{4N\mu + 1}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f$  is the probability that two alleles chosen at random are identical by descent within our population,  $1 - f$  is the probability that two alleles chosen at random are *not* identical by descent in our population. So  $1 - f = 4N\mu/(4N\mu + 1)$  is a reasonable measure of the genetic diversity within the population. Notice that as  $N$  increases, the genetic diversity maintained in the population also increases. This shouldn't be too surprising. The rate at which diversity is lost declines as population size increases so larger populations should retain more diversity than small ones.<sup>2</sup>

## A two-allele model with recurrent mutation


There's another way of looking at the interaction between drift and mutation. Suppose we have a set of populations with two alleles,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . Suppose further that the rate of

---

<sup>1</sup>Technically what the population reaches is not an equilibrium. It reaches a stationary distribution. At any point in time there is some probability that the population has a particular distribution. After long enough the probability distribution stops changing. That's when the population is at its stationary distribution. We often say that it's "reached stationarity." This is an example of a place where the inbreeding analogy breaks down a little.

<sup>2</sup>Remember that if we're dealing with a non-ideal population, as we always are, you'll need to substitute  $N_e$  for  $N$  in this equation and others like it.

mutation from  $A_1$  to  $A_2$  is equal to the rate of mutation from  $A_2$  to  $A_1$ .<sup>3</sup> Call that rate  $\mu$ . In the absence of mutation a fraction  $p_0$  of the populations would fix on  $A_1$  and the rest would fix on  $A_2$ , where  $p_0$  is the original frequency of  $A_1$ . With recurrent mutation, no population will ever be permanently fixed for one allele or the other. Instead we see the following:



When  $4N\mu < 1$  the stationary distribution of allele frequencies is bowl-shaped, i.e., most populations have allele frequencies near 0 or 1. When  $4N\mu > 1$ , the stationary distribution of allele frequencies is hump-shaped, i.e., most populations have allele frequencies near 0.5. In other words if the population is “small,” drift dominates the distribution of allele frequencies and causes populations to become differentiated. If the population is “large,” mutation dominates and keeps the allele frequencies in the different populations similar to one another.

A population is large with respect to the drift-mutation process if  $4N\mu > 1$ , and it is small if  $4N\mu < 1$ . Notice that calling a population large or small is really just a convenient shorthand. There isn’t much of a difference between the allele frequency distributions when  $4N\mu = 0.9$  and when  $4N\mu = 1.1$ . Notice also that because mutation is typically rare, on the order of  $10^{-5}$  per locus per generation or less a population must be pretty large ( $> 25,000$ ) to be considered large with respect to the drift-migration process.

---

<sup>3</sup>We don’t have to make this assumption, but relaxing it makes an already fairly complicated scenario even more complicated. If you’re really interested, ask me about it.

## Drift and migration

I just pointed out that if populations are isolated from one another they will tend to diverge from one another as a result of genetic drift. Recurrent mutation, which “pushes” all populations towards the same allele frequency, is one way in which that tendency can be opposed. If populations are not isolated, but exchange migrants with one another, this also will oppose the tendency for populations to become different from one another. It should be obvious that there will be a tradeoff similar to the one with mutation: the larger the populations the less the tendency for them to diverge from one another and, therefore, the more migration will tend to make them similar. To explore how drift and migration interact we can use an approach exactly analogous to what we used for mutation.

The model of migration we’ll consider is an extremely oversimplified one. It imagines that every allele brought into a population is different from any of the resident alleles.<sup>4</sup> It also imagines that all populations receive the fraction of migrants. Because any immigrant allele is different, by assumption, from any resident allele we don’t even have to keep track of how far apart populations are from one another, since populations close by will be no more similar to one another than populations far apart. This is Wright’s island model of migration. Given these assumptions, we can write the following:

$$f_{t+1} = \left( \left( \frac{1}{2N} \right) + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N} \right) f_t \right) (1 - m)^2 \quad . \quad (3)$$

That might look fairly familiar. In fact, it’s identical to equation (2) except that there’s an  $m$  in (3) instead of a  $\mu$ .  $m$  is the migration rate, the fraction of individuals in a population that is composed of immigrants. More precisely,  $m$  is the *backwards* migration rate. It’s the probability that a randomly chosen individual in this generation *came from* a population different from the one in which it is currently found in the preceding generation. Normally we’d think about the *forwards* migration rate, i.e., the probability that a randomly chosen individual with *go to* a different population in the next generation, but backwards migration rates turn out to be more convenient to work with in most population genetic models.<sup>5</sup>

It shouldn’t surprise you that if equations (2) and (3) are so similar the equilibrium  $f$  under drift and migration is

$$\hat{f} = \frac{1}{4Nm + 1}$$

In fact, the two allele analog to the mutation model I presented earlier turns out to be pretty similar, too.

---

<sup>4</sup>Sounds a lot like the infinite alleles model of mutation, doesn’t it? Just you wait. The parallel gets even more striking.

<sup>5</sup>I warned you weeks ago that population geneticists tend to think backwards.

- If  $2Nm > 1$ , the stationary distribution of allele frequencies is hump-shaped, i.e., the populations tend not to diverge from one another.<sup>6</sup>
- If  $2Nm < 1$ , the stationary distribution of allele frequencies is bowl-shaped, i.e., the populations tend to diverge from one another.

Now there's a consequence of these relationships that's both surprising and odd.  $N$  is the population size.  $m$  is the fraction of individuals in the population that are immigrants. So  $Nm$  is the *number* of individuals in the population that are new immigrants in any generation. That means that if populations receive more than one new immigrant every other generation, on average, they'll tend not to diverge in allele frequency from one another.<sup>7</sup> It doesn't make any difference if the populations have a million individuals a piece or ten. One new immigrant every other generation is enough to keep them from diverging.

With a little more reflection, this result is less surprising than it initially seems. After all in populations of a million individual, drift will be operating very slowly, so it doesn't take a large proportion of immigrants to keep populations from diverging.<sup>8</sup> In populations with only ten individuals, drift will be operating much more quickly, so it takes a large proportion of immigrants to keep populations from diverging.<sup>9</sup>

## Creative Commons License

These notes are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, California 94305, USA.

---

<sup>6</sup>You read that right it's  $2Nm$  not  $4Nm$  as you might have expected from the mutation model. If you're *really* interested why there's a difference, I can show you. But the explanation isn't simple.

<sup>7</sup>In the sense that the stationary distribution of allele frequencies is hump-shaped.

<sup>8</sup>And one immigrant every other generation corresponds to a backwards migration rate of only  $5 \times 10^{-7}$ .

<sup>9</sup>And one immigrant every other generation corresponds to a backwards migration rate of  $5 \times 10^{-2}$ .