

# BERNSTEIN DUALITY REVISITED: FREQUENCY-DEPENDENT SELECTION, COORDINATED MUTATION AND OPPOSING ENVIRONMENTS

F. CORDERO<sup>1,2</sup>, S. HUMMEL<sup>3</sup>, AND G. VÉCHAMBRE<sup>4</sup>

ABSTRACT. Population models usually come in pairs; one process describes forward evolution (e.g. type composition) and the other describes backward evolution (e.g. lines of descent). These processes are often linked by a formal relationship known as duality. Ideally, one of the two processes is easier to analyze, and the duality relation is so simple that properties of the more involved process can be inferred from the simpler one. This is the case when the forward process admits a moment dual. Unfortunately, moment duality seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Various approaches have been used to analyze models in the absence of a moment dual, one of them is based on Bernstein duality and another one on Siegmund duality. As a rule of thumb, the first approach seems to work well whenever the ancestral processes are positive recurrent; the second one, in contrast, works well in situations where the ancestral structures can grow to infinity (in size). The second approach was recently used to provide a full characterization of the long-term behavior of a broad class of  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher processes subject to frequency-dependent selection and opposing environments. In this paper, we use the first approach to complete the picture, i.e. we describe the long-term behavior of a different class of  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher processes, which covers many of the cases that were not covered by the aforementioned result (the two classes intersect, but none is a proper subset of the other one). Moreover, we extend the notion of Bernstein duality to cases with (single and coordinated) mutations and environmental selection, and we use it to show ergodic properties of the process.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Populations that are subject to evolutionary forces like selection, mutation and changing external environments, can have peculiar type-frequency processes. Even in simple settings where only two types of individuals can be distinguished, different long-term behaviors can be observed. In the absence of mutations, the typical behavior is that one of the two types becomes fixed and the other becomes extinct. However, other behavior, such as coexistence, are also possible. This has recently been demonstrated in [7] in the setting of two-types  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher models subject to frequency-dependent selection and an environment with opposing effects. One of the main results in [7] is a full description of possible long-term behaviors under the assumption that the strength of neutral reproductions and of the environment are not too strong (see [7, Thm 2.1] for the precise statement). As a consequence of this result, a non-trivial class of models exhibiting coexistence was uncovered. Furthermore, it was shown that in such models, coexistence requires frequency-dependent selection.

The work in [7] was preceded by several studies, where only fixation and extinction were observed. Bah and Pardoux [3], Foucart [8] and Griffiths [12] considered  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher models subject to genic selection. The results therein were greatly extended by Gozález-Casanova and Spanò to models incorporating a special form of frequency-dependent selection (fittest type wins) and by Gozález-Casanova et al. [10] to populations evolving in an environment favorable to the fittest type (see also [5]). A common theme in these papers was *moment duality*, a simple relation that allowed the moments of the type-frequency process to be expressed in terms of an ancestral process, the moment dual, which counts the number of potential ancestors. The existence of a moment dual in this setting is closely related to the property that all modeled forces always favor the same type. The first attempt to study models breaking this rule was based on a genealogical approach in Cordero et al. [6], where the long-term behavior of  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process under general polynomial frequency-dependent selection was analyzed. In this context, the strength of selective pressure and the type that is in selective advantage at a given

---

Date: 02/07/2024.

time depend on the type composition of the population. The main contribution in [6] was to generalize the concept of moment duality to a more general relation, the *Bernstein duality* (see also [13] for more general frequency-dependent selection forms). The latter relation still enables computing the moments of the type-frequency process in terms of a tractable ancestral structure. This led the authors to prove that, provided the strength of neutral reproductions is sufficiently large in comparison to the strength of selection, the probabilities of fixation and extinction are both positive and complementary (no coexistence). Another contribution outside the moment duality setting was given by Véchambre [19], who studied a Wright–Fisher process evolving in an environment with opposing effects via an analysis of the combinatorial properties of the underlying ancestral structure. The analysis in [7] uses the Siegmund dual, whose existence is guaranteed under very mild conditions (see [18]). This comes at the cost that an interpretation of the process in terms of an ancestral structure is not obvious.

When bidirectional mutations are introduced into the model, permanent extinction and fixation are no longer possible. The focus then typically shifts to existence and characterization of a stationary distribution, and to establishing convergence rates. Once again, moment duality turns out to be a powerful tool to answer these questions, see e.g. [5], [2], and [11]. In the present work we consider quite general forms of mutation. We refer to them as individual and coordinated mutations, as in [11]. In addition, we also allow for environments with opposing (coordinated) effects and for frequency-dependent selection to be of general polynomial form. This setting precludes, in general, a moment duality.

The purpose of this paper is threefold. First, to extend the notion of Bernstein duality from [6] to a broader class of  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher processes with frequency-dependent selection, including mutations (individual and coordinated) and the opposing effects of a random environment. To do so, we use a combinatorial approach to prove the duality, which we believe makes the proof simpler and more intuitive than a direct computation. Second, to use Bernstein duality to characterize the limit behavior of these processes in the absence of mutations, assuming that neutral reproductions are sufficiently strong. In doing so, we will close a gap in the classification result in [7] (see Theorem 2.7 and Remark 2.10). More specifically, we prove that under a simple condition on the parameters, in the long run one of the two types in the population fixates; both types having a positive probability of fixation. And third, to use Bernstein duality in the presence of mutations to characterize the long-term behavior of the forward process. In particular, we focus on ergodic properties of the model.

The results in [6] and the extensions presented in [13] and in the present manuscript show the robustness and the potential of Bernstein duality to the study of population models. For that reason, we have made an effort to make the original notion more accessible. Our hope is that this makes it easier for other scientists to adapt the ideas to their processes at hand. For example, we have not only adapted the proofs in [6] to our setting, but also provide simpler proofs for some results when possible. Moreover, to make the presentation self-contained, we initially focus on the motivation and biological interpretation of the involved processes.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the class of  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher processes we consider in the present paper. To provide intuition to the dynamics we introduce the finite population (individual-based) counterpart of our model. This facilitates to uncover the corresponding ancestral structures. Based on this, we define the so-called Bernstein coefficient process. We then state the main results of the paper, in particular the Bernstein duality relating the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process and the Bernstein coefficient process, and the results on the long term behavior of the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process. In Section 3 we establish some properties of the Bernstein coefficient process and prove the Bernstein duality. In Section 4 we prove the remaining main results.

**1.1. Notation.** The positive and non-negative integers are denoted by  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , respectively. The non-negative real numbers are denoted by  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad [n]_0 := [n] \cup \{0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad ]n] := [n] \setminus \{1\}.$$

For any Borel set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_f(S)$  is the set of finite measures on  $S$ .

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$ , we write  $B \sim \text{Bin}(n, x)$  if  $B$  is a binomial random variable with parameters  $n$  and  $x$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(B = i) = \binom{n}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n-i}$  for  $i \in [n]_0$ . For  $n, k, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $n \geq k \vee j$ , we write

$K \sim \text{Hyp}(n, k, j)$  if  $K$  is a hypergeometric random variable with parameters  $n, k$ , and  $j$ , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(K = i) = \frac{\binom{k}{i} \binom{n-k}{j-i}}{\binom{n}{j}}, \quad i \in \{0 \vee (j+k-n), \dots, k \wedge j\}.$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$  and  $i \in [n+\ell]$ , we define the distribution  $\text{HP}(n+\ell, \ell, i)$  via the following *hypergeometric pairing*. Consider an urn containing  $n+\ell$  balls with  $i$  of them being red and  $n+\ell-i$  being blue. If  $\ell$  pairs of balls are formed uniformly at random; the other  $n-\ell$  balls are kept unpaired, then  $R \sim \text{HP}(n+\ell, \ell, i)$  denotes the number of groups (pairs and singletons) containing at least one red ball.

## 2. MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

The process under investigation together with its characterizing SDE are introduced in Section 2.1. Section 2.2 is optional and contains background on the SDE and its underlying graphical representation. More importantly, it serves as a motivation for the dual process introduced in Sections 2.3 and 2.4. The main results are stated in Section 2.5.

**2.1.  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process.** The aim of this work is to study the evolution of an infinite two-type population that is subject to random reproduction, frequency-dependent selection, mutation (individual and coordinated) and the effects of an environment with opposing effects (a special form of coordinated reproductions). To set up the model, we first introduce the relevant parameters. Let  $a$  and  $A$  denote the two types of individuals in the population (for example, corresponding to particular alleles). The intensity of neutral reproduction, environmental change and coordinated mutation are described by means of three finite measures  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{M}_f([0, 1])$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_f([-1, 1])$ , with  $\mu(\{0\}) = \nu(\{0\}) = 0$ , respectively. Individual mutation rates are given by  $\vec{\theta} := (\theta_a, \theta_A) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ . Frequency dependent selection is characterized by a number  $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\kappa > 1$ , modeling the maximal degree of interaction, a vector of rates  $\beta := (\beta_\ell)_{\ell \in [\kappa]} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\kappa-1}$ , coding the strength of the various types of selective events, and a collection of probabilities  $p := (p_i^{(\ell)} : \ell \in [\kappa], i \in [\ell]_0)$  with  $p_i^{(\ell)} \in [0, 1]$  and  $p_0^{(\ell)} = 0 = 1 - p_\ell^{(\ell)}$ , setting the type-propagation rules at selective events. Given  $(\kappa, \beta, p)$ , the effect of frequency-dependent selection is summarized by the polynomial

$$d_{(\kappa, \beta, p)}(x) := \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{i} x^i (1-x)^{\ell-i} \left( p_i^{(\ell)} - \frac{i}{\ell} \right).$$

We write  $X_t$  for the proportion of type- $a$  individuals present at time  $t$ , and assume  $X := (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  evolves according to the SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \sqrt{\Lambda(\{0\})X_t(1-X_t)} dW_t + \int_{(0,1] \times [0,1]} r(\mathbf{1}_{\{u \leq X_{t-}\}}(1-X_{t-}) - \mathbf{1}_{\{u > X_{t-}\}}X_{t-}) \tilde{N}(dt, dr, du) \\ &+ (d_{(\kappa, \beta, p)}(X_t) + \theta_a(1-X_t) - \theta_A X_t) dt + \int_{(-1,1)} |r|(\mathbf{1}_{\{r \geq 0\}}(1-X_{t-}) - \mathbf{1}_{\{r < 0\}}X_{t-}) M(dt, dr) \\ &+ \int_{(-1,1)} r X_{t-}(1-X_{t-}) S(dt, dr). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Here,  $W := (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a one dimensional standard Brownian motion,  $\tilde{N}(dt, dr, du)$  is a compensated Poisson measure on  $[0, \infty) \times (0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  with intensity  $dt \times r^{-2} \Lambda(dr) \times du$ ,  $S(dt, dr)$  and  $M(dt, dr)$  are Poisson measures on  $[0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$  with intensity  $dt \times |r|^{-1} \mu(dr)$  and  $dt \times |r|^{-1} \nu(dr)$ , respectively. We assume that  $B$ ,  $\tilde{N}$ ,  $M$  and  $S$  are independent. The existence and pathwise uniqueness of strong solutions of SDE (2.1) can be shown analogously to [6, Lemma 3.2] (see also [7, Prop. A3]). We refer to  $X := (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  as the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process with frequency-dependent selection  $(\kappa, \beta, p)$ , individual and coordinated mutation  $(\vec{\theta}, \nu)$  and random environment  $\mu$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{P}_x$  the probability measure associated with  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  under the initial condition  $X_0 = x \in [0, 1]$ , and by  $\mathbb{E}_x$  the associated expectation.

It is well-known that SDEs of the form (2.1) arise as large population limits of constant size Wright–Fisher and Moran models. This has been shown in several special cases of (2.1) via classical methods

(convergence of the generators), see e.g. [9] (for the case  $p_i^{(\ell)} = \delta_{i,\ell}$ ,  $\mu = \nu = 0$ , and  $\vec{\theta} = 0$ ), [6] (for the case  $\mu = \nu = 0$  and  $\vec{\theta} = 0$ ), [5] (for the case  $\Lambda = \delta_{\{0\}}$ ,  $\mu((-1, 0)) = 0$ , and  $\nu = 0$ ); see also [4] for a rather general convergence result for discrete-time Wright–Fisher models. Extending the previous results to our framework is standard routine, and therefore we refrain from doing it here (however, this exercise does not appear explicitly in the literature for the current process). Nevertheless, we will describe the finite state space Markov chain counterpart of SDE (2.1) to provide intuition for each term in (2.1). As a by-product, this individual-based dynamics will help us to give intuition on the limiting genealogies.

**2.2. Moran model counterpart to the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process.** Consider a population of constant size  $K$  consisting of two types of individuals:  $a$  and  $A$ . The population is subject to reproductions, which can be neutral, selective or triggered by the environment, and to mutations, which can occur individually or in a coordinated manner. The parameters of the model are  $\theta_a^{(K)} := \theta_a/K$ ,  $\theta_A^{(K)} := \theta_A/K$ ,  $\beta^{(K)} := \beta/K$ , and the random measures  $\tilde{N}^{(K)}$ ,  $M^{(K)}$  and  $S^{(K)}$  obtained by slowing down time by  $1/K$  in  $\tilde{N}$ ,  $M$  and  $S$ , respectively (The specific choice of the parameters is not essential and only aims at simplicity; the parameters can be chosen in a more general way and still lead to the same asymptotic behavior; see e.g. [6, Thm. 2.2] for the case without mutations and without environments.) Denote by  $X_t^{(K)}$  the fraction of type- $a$  individuals present in the population at time  $t$ . We describe now how the mechanisms of the model affect the evolution of the population.

**Neutral reproductions** are present into two forms:

- *Single offspring*: each individual reproduces independently of each other at rate  $\Lambda(\{0\})/2$ , its single offspring inherits the parental type and replaces an individual in the population chosen uniformly at random.
- *Large offspring*: at the points  $(t, r, u)$  of  $\tilde{N}^{(K)}$  each individual is killed, independently of others, with probability  $r$  and is replaced by the offspring of one individual in the population, which is chosen uniformly at random among the type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) individuals if  $X_{t-}^{(K)} \leq u$  (resp.  $X_{t-}^{(K)} > u$ ).

**Selective reproductions** are the result of  $\ell$ -interactions,  $\ell \in [\kappa]$ . This means that, each individual is selected at rate  $\beta_\ell^{(K)}$  to randomly gather a group of  $\ell$  individuals (with the selected individual being part of the  $\ell$ -group). If the group consists of  $i$  type- $a$  individuals and  $\ell - i$  type- $A$  individuals, one individual is chosen uniformly at random from the type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) population with probability  $p_i^{(\ell)}$  (resp.  $1 - p_i^{(\ell)}$ ) to produce one single offspring that inherits the parental type and replaces the founder of the group.

**Environmental reproductions** are coordinated and triggered by the environment. More precisely, at the points  $(t, r)$  of  $S^{(K)}$  with  $r > 0$  (resp.  $r < 0$ ) each individual of type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) independently of each other, produces with probability  $|r|$  a single offspring, which inherits its type; the group of newborns replaces a group of the same size chosen uniformly at random.

**Individual mutations** affect independently each individual and occur at constant rate; each individual mutates to type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) at rate  $\theta_a^{(K)}$  (resp.  $\theta_A^{(K)}$ ).

**Coordinated mutations** are driven by the measure  $M^{(K)}$ : at the points  $(t, r)$  of  $M^{(K)}$  with  $r > 0$  (resp.  $r < 0$ ) each individual independently of each other, mutates with probability  $|r|$  to type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ).

As mentioned earlier, one can prove using standard methods that  $(X_{Kt}^{(K)})_{t \geq 0}$  converges in distribution as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  to the solution  $(X, \mathbb{P}_x)$  of (2.1), provided that the initial conditions  $X_0^{(K)}$  converge to  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

*The graphical representation.* In the finite population setting, the randomness arising from the initial type configuration can be decoupled in a standard way from that arising from reproductive, environmental and mutation events. The randomness originated by these events can be represented via graphical elements (arrows and circles) on the diagram  $\mathcal{D} := [0, \infty) \times [N]$ , see Fig. 1 for an illustration. The  $i$ -th individual in the population at time  $t$  corresponds to the point  $(t, i) \in \mathcal{D}$ , and hence its lifetime is a horizontal segment  $[t_0, t_\dagger) \times \{i\}$ . Forward time runs from left to right. Mutations to type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) are depicted as grey (resp. black) circles rates. Neutral reproductive events are depicted as vertical arrows with the parental line at the tail and the offspring line at the tip (multiple arrows sharing a tail in the case of




FIGURE 1. A graphical representation of the untyped Moran model (bold and semi-transparent elements) and the associated ASG (bold elements) to a sample of three individuals at forward time time  $t = T$ .

large reproductions). Selective reproductions are represented by a set of open-headed arrows, with the tips at the individual to be replaced and tails at the potential parents, we refer to them also as selective arrow(head)s. Environmental reproductions are depicted by arrows with a grey (resp. black) diamond at the tail, if the environment favors type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) at that reproduction time; we call them environmental arrow(head)s. These graphical elements arise in the untyped diagram according to the arrival times of independent Poisson processes. We need to take into account that environmental arrows are drawn in absence of knowledge of types. This means that, at a point  $(t, r)$  of  $S^{(K)}$  with  $r > 0$  (resp.  $r < 0$ ), we draw  $k \sim \text{Bin}(K, |r|)$  arrows, with grey (resp. black) diamonds at the tails, between two groups of  $k$  individuals chosen uniformly at random. When types will later on be added to the picture (see below), the surplus of environmental arrows (those for which the individual at the tail is not of the type favored by the environment) will be ignored. The rates of appearance of all graphical elements can be worked out easily from the previous description of the Moran model.

Once these graphical elements have been drawn on the diagram  $\mathcal{D}$  between times 0 and  $T$ , we can fix a type configuration at time 0, and propagate types forward in time along the lines of the diagram respecting the following rules:

- The type in an horizontal line changes only when the line encounters a circle or an arrowhead.
- If a line encounters a grey circle (resp. black), the type of the line after the circle is  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ).
- If a line encounters a neutral arrowhead, the type of the line after the arrowhead is the type at the tail of the arrow.
- If a line encounters an environmental arrowhead and the tail of the arrow is a grey (resp. black) diamond, the type of the line after the arrowhead is the type at the tail only if that type is  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ), otherwise the arrow is ignored.
- If a line simultaneously encounters  $\ell - 1$  selective arrowheads, and among the  $\ell$  lines involved exactly  $i$  of them have type  $a$ , then the type of the line after the event is  $a$  with probability  $p_{i,\ell}$  or  $A$  with probability  $1 - p_{i,\ell}$ .

*The ancestral picture.* The graphical construction is also the key to associate to the model an ancestral structure generalizing the *Ancestral selection graph (ASG)* of Krone and Neuhauser [14, 16] (or more precisely of the killed-ASG [1]). Pick an untyped sample at time  $T$  and trace back the lines of its potential influencers; backward time will be denoted by  $r$ , where  $r = T - t$  and  $t$  denotes forward time. A potential influencer is an individual whose type may have an influence on the type configuration of the sample. The arrows and circles in the diagram change the number of potential influencers and their respective locations as follows (recall that we are working untyped, i.e. without previous knowledge of the types of the lines):

- If a line encounters a circle, we stop following that line, because its type is determined by the mutation, but we keep the circle at the end of that line for later use.

- If a group of lines encounters neutral arrowheads, we stop following them and we add to the ASG the line at the (common) tail of the arrows (i.e. a coalescence event takes place). The reason is that the line of the tail determine the types of all the lines at the tips.
- If a group of lines encounter environmental arrowheads, we add the lines at the diamond tails to the ASG. The reason for this, is that to decide who are the parents of the individuals at the tips of the arrows we need to know the types at the tails.
- If a line encounters  $\ell - 1$  selective arrowheads, we add the lines at the tails to the ASG, because to determine the type of the line hit by the arrows, we need to know the type configuration of all the involved lines.

See again Fig. 1 for an illustration. The ASG contains all the relevant information from the graphical picture to determine the types in the sample. However, note that in contrast to classical settings, the types in the sample are, in general, not a deterministic function of the ASG and the initial configuration of types. The reason is that the outcome of a selective event is random and not fully determined by the types of the individuals in the group. To determine the types in the sample, we only need to assign types to the lines in the ASG at time  $t = 0$  ( $r = T$ ) and propagate the types forward in time using the rules for type propagation in the diagram  $\mathcal{D}$  until time  $t = T$  ( $r = 0$ ).

**2.3. Ancestral selection graph.** A rather standard way of guessing the ancestral process associated to the SDE (2.1) is an asymptotic analysis as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  of the rates at which events are occurring in the finite size population ASG described at the end of the previous section (see e.g. [5] and [6]). In our setting this yields the following branching-coalescing system.

*The branching-coalescing system.* Start from  $n$  lines with each line representing an individual.

- *Coalescences (neutral events).* For  $n > 1$  and  $\ell \in [n]$  every group of  $\ell$  lines among  $n$  coalesces into one at rate

$$\lambda_{n,\ell} := \int_{[0,1]} r^{\ell-2} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \Lambda(dr), \quad (2.2)$$

with the convention that  $0^0 = 1$  (in particular  $\lambda_{n,2} = \Lambda(\{0\}) + \int_{(0,1]} (1-r)^{n-2} \Lambda(dr)$ ).

- *Selective branching.* Every line independently splits into  $\ell$  at rate  $\beta_\ell$ .
- *Single mutations.* For  $c \in \{a, A\}$ , every line, independently of each other, is subject to a type- $c$  mutation at rate  $\theta_c$ . The line ends in a circle; the circle is grey for  $c = a$  and black for  $c = A$ .
- *Coordinated mutations.* For  $c \in \{a, A\}$ , and  $\ell \in [n]$  every group of  $\ell$  lines among  $n$  is subject to a *coordinated  $c$ -mutation* at rate  $m_{n,\ell}^c$ , where

$$m_{n,\ell}^a = \int_{(0,1)} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \nu(dr) \quad \text{and} \quad m_{n,\ell}^A = \int_{(-1,0)} |r|^{\ell-1} (1-|r|)^{n-\ell} \nu(dr). \quad (2.3)$$

Each of the  $\ell$  lines ends in a circle; the circle is grey for  $c = a$  and black for  $c = A$ .

- *Environmental branching.* For  $c \in \{a, A\}$ , and  $\ell \in [n]$  every group of  $\ell$  lines among  $n$  is subject to a *simultaneous  $c$ -branching* at rate  $\sigma_{n,\ell}^c$  where

$$\sigma_{n,\ell}^a = \int_{(0,1)} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \mu(dr) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{n,\ell}^A = \int_{(-1,0)} |r|^{\ell-1} (1-|r|)^{n-\ell} \mu(dy), \quad (2.4)$$

i.e. each of the  $\ell$  lines splits into two lines, one continuing and one incoming. The incoming lines start with a diamond; the diamond is grey for  $c = a$  and black for  $c = A$ .

We call the branching-coalescing structure that arises under the above dynamics an *Ancestral selection graph* (ASG), see Fig. 2 for an illustration.

Denote by  $L_t$  the number of lines present in the ASG at time  $t$ . We refer to the process  $L := (L_t)_{t \geq 0}$  as the line-counting process of the ASG; it is a continuous-time Markov Chain on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  with transitions

- For  $n > 1$  and  $\ell \in [n]$ :  $n \rightarrow n - \ell + 1$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} \lambda_{n,\ell}$ .
- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in [n]$ :  $n \rightarrow n + \ell$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}$  with  $\sigma_{n,\ell} := \sigma_{n,\ell}^a + \sigma_{n,\ell}^A$ .
- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in [\kappa]$ :  $n \rightarrow n + \ell - 1$  at rate  $n \beta_\ell$ .




FIGURE 2. An illustration of the ASG. Type  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ) mutations are depicted as grey (resp. black) circles. At times  $r_1$ ,  $r_2$  and  $r_8$  we observe selective branching events (selective arrows with open-headed arrows). At times  $r_3$  and  $r_4$  coalescences occur. Times  $r_5$  and  $r_9$  shows coordinated mutations to type  $A$  and  $a$ , respectively. At times  $r_6$  and  $r_7$  we see environmental branching of type  $a$  and  $A$  (arrows with a diamond tail), respectively.

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in [n]$ :  $n \rightarrow n - \ell$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell=1\}} n \theta$  with

$$m_{n,\ell} := m_{n,\ell}^a + m_{n,\ell}^A \quad \text{and} \quad \theta := \theta_a + \theta_A. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that in the presence of mutations 0 is an absorbing state for  $L$ . If there are no mutations the state 0 is never reached if  $L$  starts with at least one line, and hence, we reduce the state space to  $\mathbb{N}$ .

*The type propagation rules.* Consider now an ASG that has evolved from time 0 until backward time  $t$ . The lines at time 0 are called *roots* and the lines at time  $t$  are called *leaves*. If we assign types to the leaves of the ASG, the types propagate forward in time (from left to right) up to the roots according to the following rules

- The type in an horizontal line changes only when the line encounters an arrowhead.
- Any line starting with a grey (resp. black) circle gets type  $a$  (resp. type  $A$ ).
- Any line hit by a neutral arrowhead gets the type at the tail of the arrow.
- Any line hit by an arrowhead with a grey (resp. black) diamond at the tail, gets the type at the tail if and only if that type is  $a$  (resp.  $A$ ), otherwise the arrowhead is ignored.
- Any line hit simultaneously by  $\ell - 1$  selective arrowheads gets type  $a$  (resp. type  $A$ ) with probability  $p_i^{(\ell)}$  (resp.  $1 - p_i^{(\ell)}$ ), where  $i$  is the number of type  $a$  lines among the  $\ell$  involved lines at the time of the event.

**2.4. Bernstein coefficient process.** The ASG introduced in the previous section is a rather unwieldy object. However, in order to establish a formal relation between the process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and its genealogy, it suffices to determine the distribution of the type composition in the sample in terms of a tractable functional of the ASG. Recall that the types at the roots of an ASG represent the types in a sample of the population. They are a (random) function of the ASG and the types at the leaves. We generalize the strategy developed in [6] to our setting. That is, we keep track of the conditional probability of a type composition in the sample, given the line-counting process of the ASG. In our case, it will be convenient to distinguish at mutation events the type of the mutation, and at environmental events the type which is favored at the event. This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 2.1.** *The labeled line-counting process is the continuous-time Markov chain  $(L_t, c_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with values on  $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \{a, A\}$  and transitions*

- For  $n > 1$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c \in \{a, A\}$  :  $(n, c) \rightarrow (n - \ell + 1, c)$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} \lambda_{n,\ell}$ .
- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c \in \{a, A\}$  :  $(n, c) \rightarrow (n + \ell - 1, c)$  at rate  $n \beta_\ell$ .
- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c, b \in \{a, A\}$  :  $(n, c) \rightarrow (n + \ell, b)$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^b$ .
- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c, b \in \{a, A\}$  :  $(n, c) \rightarrow (n - \ell, b)$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell}^b + \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell=1\}} n \theta_b$ .

We set  $\vec{L}_t := (L_t, c_t)$ .

Consider now the random function  $x \mapsto P_t(x)$ , where  $P_t(x)$  denotes the conditional probability given  $(\vec{L}_r)_{r \in [0, t]}$ , that all the roots in the ASG are of type  $a$  if each leaf in the ASG is of type  $a$  or  $A$  with probability  $x$  or  $1 - x$ , respectively. The process  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is referred to in [6] as the *Ancestral Selection Polynomial*. The name stems from the fact that  $P_t$  can be expressed as

$$P_t(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{L_t} V_t(i) \binom{L_t}{i} x^i (1-x)^{L_t-i}, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

where  $V_t(i)$  represents the conditional probability given  $(L_r)_{r \in [0, t]}$ , that all the roots in the ASG are of type  $a$ , if  $i$  leaves are of type  $a$ , and  $L_t - i$  leaves are of type  $A$ . Thus, indeed  $P_t$  is a polynomial. Moreover, its degree is at most  $L_t$ , and  $V_t := (V_t(i))_{i \in [L_t]_0}$  is its vector of coefficients in the Bernstein basis of polynomials of degree at most  $L_t$ .

We will now describe the effect of the different possible transitions in the ASG to the evolution of the coefficient process  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . For the effect of coalescences and selective branching, we refer the reader to [6, Section 2.5].

**The effect of mutations.** Assume that  $L_{t-} = n$ ,  $L_t = n - \ell$  and  $c_t = a$ , that is, an  $a$ -mutation event of size  $\ell$  occurs at time  $t$ . If  $i$  of the  $n - \ell$  leaves are of type  $a$ , then at time  $t-$ ,  $i + \ell$  of the  $n$  leaves have type  $a$ . Similarly, assuming that  $L_{t-} = n$ ,  $L_t = n - \ell$  and  $c_t = A$ , that is, an  $A$ -mutation event of size  $\ell$  occurs at time  $t$ . If  $i$  of the  $n - \ell$  leaves are of type  $a$ , then at time  $t-$ ,  $i$  of the  $n$  leaves have type  $a$ .

**The effect of the environment.** Assume that  $L_{t-} = n$ ,  $L_t = n + \ell$  and  $c_t = a$ , that is, an environmental  $a$ -branching of size  $\ell$  occurs at time  $t$ . Forward in time (i.e. backward in time in the ASG) this means that  $\ell$ -pairs of lines experience a binary merger. Therefore, if  $i$  of the  $n + \ell$  lines are of type  $a$ , and  $R_{n, \ell, i}^a$  denotes the sum between the number of merging pairs containing at least one line of type  $a$ , and the number of non-merging lines of type  $a$ . Then, by the propagation rules at the end of Section 2.3, at time  $t-$ , there are  $R_{n, \ell, i}^a$  lines of type  $a$ . Note that  $R_{n, \ell, i}^a \sim \text{HP}(n + \ell, \ell, i)$ , where the distribution  $\text{HP}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is defined in Section 1.1. Similarly, assume that  $L_{t-} = n$ ,  $L_t = n + \ell$  and  $c_t = A$ , that is, an environmental  $A$ -branching of size  $\ell$  occurs at time  $t$ . As before, this means that forward in time,  $\ell$ -pairs of lines experience a binary merger. Therefore, if  $i$  of the  $n + \ell$  lines are of type  $a$ , and  $R_{n, \ell, i}^A$  denotes the sum between the number of merging pairs where the two lines are of type  $a$ , and the number of non-merging lines of type  $a$ . Then, at time  $t-$ , there are  $R_{n, \ell, i}^A$  lines of type  $a$ . Note that  $R_{n, \ell, i}^A \sim n - \text{HP}(n + \ell, \ell, n + \ell - i)$ .

This motivates the definition of the following operators.

**Definition 2.2** (Branching, mutation, coalescence operators). *Consider the following linear operators:*

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \in ]n]$ , let  $C^{n, k} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-k+2}$  with

$$C^{n, k} v := \left( \frac{i}{n-k+1} v_{i+k-1} + \left( 1 - \frac{i}{n-k+1} \right) v_i \right)_{i=0}^{n-k+1} \quad (\text{coalescence}).$$

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in ]\kappa]$ , let  $D^{n, \ell} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+\ell}$  with

$$D^{n, \ell} v := \left( \mathbb{E}[p_{K_i}^{(\ell)} v_{i+1-K_i} + (1 - p_{K_i}^{(\ell)}) v_{i-K_i}] \right)_{i=0}^{n+\ell-1} \quad (\text{selective branching}),$$

where  $K_i \sim \text{Hyp}(n + \ell - 1, i, \ell)$ .

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \in [n]$ , let  $M_a^{n, k} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-k+1}$  with

$$M_a^{n, k} v := (v_{i+k})_{i=0}^{n-k} \quad (\text{mutation}).$$

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \in [n]$ , let  $M_A^{n, k} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-k+1}$  with

$$M_A^{n, k} v := (v_i)_{i=0}^{n-k} \quad (\text{mutation}).$$

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ , define  $S_a^{n,\ell} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+\ell+1}$  with

$$S_a^{n,\ell} v := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ v_{R_{n,\ell,i}^a} \right] \right)_{i=0}^{n+\ell} \quad (\text{environmental branching}),$$

where  $R_{n,\ell,i}^a \sim \text{HP}(n + \ell, \ell, i)$ .

- For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in [n]$ , define  $S_A^{n,\ell} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+\ell+1}$  with

$$S_A^{n,\ell} v := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ v_{R_{n,\ell,i}^A} \right] \right)_{i=0}^{n+\ell} \quad (\text{environmental branching}),$$

where  $R_{n,\ell,i}^A \sim n - \text{HP}(n + \ell, \ell, n + \ell - i)$ .

Now we proceed to define the central object of this paper, the Bernstein coefficient process, which was introduced in [6] as a dual to the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process with polynomial frequency-dependent selection. The next definition generalizes its definition to include mutations, coordinated mutations and opposing environments.

**Definition 2.3** (Bernstein coefficient process). *The  $(\Lambda, \mu, \vec{\theta}, \nu, \kappa, \beta, p)$ -Bernstein coefficient process is the continuous-time Markov chain  $V := (V_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with values in*

$$\mathbb{R}^\infty := \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

and with transitions, for  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ,

- for  $k \in [n]$  :  $v \rightarrow C^{n,k} v$  at rate  $\binom{n}{k} \lambda_{n,k}$ ,
- for  $\ell \in [\kappa]$  :  $v \rightarrow D^{n,\ell} v$  at rate  $n \beta_\ell$ ,
- for  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c \in \{a, b\}$  :  $v \rightarrow M_c^{n,\ell} v$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell}^c + \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell=1\}} n \theta_c$ ,
- for  $\ell \in [n]$ ,  $c \in \{a, b\}$  :  $v \rightarrow S_c^{n,\ell} v$  at rate  $\binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^c$ .

For the state at time  $t$  we write  $V_t = (V_t(0), \dots, V_t(\dim(V_t) - 1))$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{P}_v$  the probability measure associated with  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$  under the initial condition  $V_0 = v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ , and by  $\mathbb{E}_v$  the associated expectation.

Note that the process  $(\dim(V_t) - 1)_{t \geq 0}$  is by definition equal in distribution to the process  $L$ . For this reason, we abuse the notation and write  $L_t = \dim(V_t) - 1$ . The fact that the processes  $L$  and  $V$  are well-defined at all times (ie, that they are *conservative*) follows from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4, respectively.

**2.5. Main results.** We have now collected all the ingredients to state our main results.

**2.5.1. Bernstein duality.** The duality exposed in the following theorem formalises the connection between the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher process and the Bernstein coefficient process and generalises [6, Thm. 2.14] to our setting.

**Theorem 2.4** (Bernstein duality). *Let  $X$  be the solution of (2.1) and let  $V$  be the Bernstein coefficient process. For any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $v = (v_i)_{i=0}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  we have, for  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^n v_i \binom{n}{i} X_t^i (1 - X_t)^{n-i} \right] = \mathbb{E}_v \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{L_t} v_i \binom{L_t}{i} x^i (1 - x)^{L_t-i} \right].$$

Defining the *duality functional*  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^\infty$  by

$$H(x, w) := \sum_{i=0}^{\dim(w)-1} w_i \binom{\dim(w)-1}{i} x^i (1 - x)^{\dim(w)-1-i}, \quad (2.6)$$

the duality can be rewritten in compact form as  $\mathbb{E}_x [H(X_t, v)] = \mathbb{E}_v [H(x, V_t)]$ .

Building on Theorem 2.4 we describe the long-term behavior of the process  $X$  under the following assumption

$$\sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell (\ell - 1) + \mu(-1, 1) < \int_{[0,1]} |\log(1 - r)| \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2} + \nu(-1, 1) + \theta_a + \theta_A. \quad (2.7)$$

**Remark 2.5.** *Some prominent examples of measures  $\Lambda$  satisfying (2.7) independently of the choice of other parameters are  $\Lambda = \delta_{\{0\}}$ ,  $\Lambda = \delta_{\{1\}}$ ,  $\Lambda(dr) = 1_{[0,1]}(r)r^{a-1}(1-r)^{b-1}dr$  with  $a \in (0, 1]$ ,  $b > 0$ . For these examples, assuming that  $\vec{\theta} = 0$ ,  $\mu = \nu = 0$ ,  $\beta = 0$ , the ASG coincides with Kingman's coalescent, star-shaped coalescent, and the Beta( $a, b$ )-coalescent, respectively (the Beta( $a, b$ )-coalescent with  $a = b = 1$  is the so-called Bolthausen-Szintman's coalescent).*

Our results on the long term behavior of  $X$  and its dual will be qualitatively different in the presence or absence of mutations. For this reason, we consider the two cases separately.

**2.5.2. The case without mutations.** Assume  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , i.e. no mutations. We show that in this case there is either fixation or extinction, i.e. the process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is eventually absorbed at  $\{1\}$  or  $\{0\}$  and we connect this with the asymptotic behavior of the dual  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . More precisely, we prove that from any point  $x \in (0, 1)$ , the process  $X$  either fixates or gets extinct, both possibilities having a strictly positive probability, and we relate the fixation probability to the stationary distribution of the process  $V$ .

Let  $\mathbb{M}_V$  be the set of matrices of size  $n \times 2$  for some  $n \geq 2$  that can be obtained as the product of a finite number of (compatible) branching and coalescence matrices of Definition 2.2 (the  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix is seen as an empty product of such matrices). Fix  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and denote by

$$C_V(a, b) := \left\{ M \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^\infty : M \in \mathbb{M}_V \right\},$$

the set of states that can be reached by the process  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$  starting from the initial condition  $V_0 = (a, b)^T$ . Since  $C_V(a, b)$  is a countable set we equip it with the discrete topology and consider convergence in distribution relative to that topology. Note also that the set  $C_V(a, b)$  is by definition invariant for  $V$  so that we can restrict the state space of  $V$  to  $C_V(a, b)$ .

**Proposition 2.6** (Long-term behavior of Bernstein coefficient process). *Assume that  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ . Then,  $(V_t(0) : t \geq 0)$  and  $(V_t(L_t) : t \geq 0)$  are both constant. Moreover, if in addition, (2.7) is satisfied, then the following holds.*

- (1) *For every  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , the Bernstein coefficient process  $V$  has a unique invariant probability measure  $\mu^{a,b}$  with support included in  $\{v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty : v_0 = a, v_{\dim(v)-1} = b\}$ .*
- (2) *Let  $V_\infty^{a,b}$  be a random variable with law  $\mu^{a,b}$ . If  $V_0 = v$  with  $v_0 = a$  and  $v_{\dim(v)-1} = b$ , then*

$$V_t \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} V_\infty^{a,b}.$$

This result is proved analogously to [6, Prop. 2.24], but since the proof is short and informative, we provide it in Section 4.1 for the sake of completeness. In particular, it will become apparent that (2.7) ensures the positive recurrence of  $L$  (resp. almost sure absorption of  $L$  in the case with mutations).

**Theorem 2.7** (Fixation/Extinction). *Assume that  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , and that (2.7) is satisfied. For any  $x \in (0, 1)$ ,  $X_t$  converges almost surely to a  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variable  $X_\infty$ . Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{P}_x(X_\infty = 1) = \mathbb{E}[H(x, V_\infty^{0,1})] \in (0, 1), \quad (2.8)$$

where the random variable  $V_\infty^{0,1}$  is as in Proposition 2.6.

**Remark 2.8** (The case without environment). *If in addition to  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , we assume that  $\mu = 0$ , then Theorem 2.7 coincides with [6, Prop. 2.27].*

**Remark 2.9** (The case with environment and classical selection). *If we assume that  $\vec{\theta} = 0$ ,  $\nu = 0$ ,  $\kappa = 2$ ,  $\Lambda = \delta_0$  and  $\int_{(-1,1)} |r|^{-1} \mu(dr) < \infty$  then a different representation of the fixation probability is provided in [19] (see also [5] for the case  $\mu((-1, 0)) = 0$ ).*

**Remark 2.10** (Boundary classification under weak neutral reproductions). *In addition to  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , assume that*

$$\Lambda(\{0, 1\}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{(0,1)} \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r} < \infty. \quad (2.9)$$

We can think of (2.9) as a condition ensuring that 1) the weight of small neutral reproductions is not too strong and that 2) no single neutral reproduction replaces the entire population. Define  $\sigma$  as the polynomial satisfying  $x(1-x)\sigma(x) = d_{\kappa,\beta,p}(x)$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ ;  $\sigma$  is well-defined, because  $d_{\kappa,\beta,p}$  is a polynomial vanishing at 0 and 1. Set also  $\hat{\mu}(dr) = |r|^{-1}\mu(dr)$ . With this notation, the solution  $X$  of (2.1) is, in the terminology of [7], a  $(\Lambda, \hat{\mu}, \sigma)$ -Wright-Fisher process. In [7, Thm. 2.1(2)] it was proved that, under condition (2.9), if

$$\sigma(0) - \int_{(-1,1)} |\log(1+r)| \frac{\mu(dr)}{|r|} < \int_{[0,1]} |\log(1-r)| \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2} \quad (2.10)$$

$$-\sigma(1) - \int_{(-1,1)} |\log(1-r)| \frac{\mu(dr)}{|r|} < \int_{[0,1]} |\log(1-r)| \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2}, \quad (2.11)$$

then  $X_t$  converges a.s. to a  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variable  $X_\infty$  with  $\mathbb{P}_x(X_\infty = 1) \in (0, 1)$  (in the terminology of [7] this means that 0 and 1 are attractive for  $X$ ). Now, note that if (2.9) is not satisfied, then (2.10), (2.11) and (2.7) are trivially satisfied (the right-hand side is  $\infty$ ). Therefore, as a consequence of Theorem 2.7, the statement of [7, Thm. 2.1(2)] also holds when condition (2.9) is not satisfied. This closes the gap in the boundary classification [7, Thm. 2.1].

2.5.3. *The case with mutations.* Assume  $\vec{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$ , i.e. there are mutations. We show that in this case the process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is ergodic, which is also connected with the asymptotic behavior of the dual  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ .

**Proposition 2.11** (Long-term behavior of Bernstein coefficient process). *Assume that  $\vec{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$ . If (2.7) is satisfied, then, almost surely the process  $V$  is absorbed in a (random) state  $V_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$  in finite time.*

The following theorem shows that then the process  $X$  has a unique stationary distribution, which can be expressed via the absorption probabilities of the process  $V$ .

**Theorem 2.12** (Stationary distribution). *Assume that  $\vec{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$  and that (2.7) is satisfied. Then the process  $X$  has a unique stationary distribution  $\mathcal{L}$  that is characterized by its moments*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \rho_n := \int_{[0,1]} x^n \mathcal{L}(dx) = \mathbb{E}_{e_n}[V_\infty], \quad (2.12)$$

where  $e_n$  denotes the  $(n+1)$ th unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $V_\infty$  is as in Proposition 2.11. Moreover, for any initial distribution in  $(0, 1)$ , the law of  $X_t$  converges weakly to  $\mathcal{L}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

The following proposition provides the recursive relations satisfied by the moments  $\rho_n$  of the stationary distribution  $\mathcal{L}$  from Theorem 2.12.

**Proposition 2.13** (Moment recursions). *Assume that  $\vec{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$  and that (2.7) is satisfied. Define for any  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n := & \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \Lambda(\{0\}) + \int_{(0,1]} (1 - (1-r)^n - nr(1-r)^{n-1}) r^{-2} \Lambda(dr) \\ & + \int_{(-1,1)} (1 - (1-|r|)^n) |r|^{-1} (\mu + \nu)(dr) + n \left( \theta + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, set for  $k \in [n-1]_0$ ,

$$\alpha_{n,k} := \binom{n}{k} (m_{n,n-k}^a + \theta_a \mathbb{1}_{k=n-1}) + \mathbb{1}_{k \geq 1} \binom{n}{k-1} \lambda_{n,n-k+1},$$

and for  $k \in \{n, \dots, (n+\kappa-1) \vee 2n\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{n,k} := & \mathbf{1}_{k \leq n+\kappa-1} \left( \sum_{\ell=2 \vee (k+1-n)}^{\kappa} n \beta_{\ell} \sum_{i=n}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-i} p_{i+1-n}^{(\ell)}!}{(n+l-1-k)!(k-i)!(i+1-n)!} \right) \\ & + \mathbf{1}_{k \leq 2n} \left( \mathbf{1}_{k \geq n+1} \binom{n}{k-n} \sigma_{n,k-n}^A + \sum_{\ell=1 \vee (k-n)}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^a \sum_{i=n}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-i} 2^{n+\ell-i}!}{(n+l-k)!(k-i)!(i-n)!} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\alpha_n \rho_n = \sum_{k=0}^{(n+\kappa-1) \vee 2n} \alpha_{n,k} \rho_k. \quad (2.13)$$

### 3. PROPERTIES OF THE BERNSTEIN DUAL AND PROOF OF THE DUALITY

**3.1. First properties of the processes  $L$  and  $V$ .** Let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}^L \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0}$  the rate matrix of the line-counting process  $L = (L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . More precisely, for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $i \neq j$ ,  $\mathcal{B}^L(i, j)$  is the total transition rate from  $i$  to  $j$  and, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{B}^L(i, i) := -\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{i\}} \mathcal{B}^L(i, j)$ . Note from Definition 2.1 that  $\mathcal{B}^L(i, \cdot)$  has finite support for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . For any function  $g : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we set  $\mathcal{B}^L g$  to be the function defined via  $\mathcal{B}^L g(i) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{B}^L(i, j)(g(j) - g(i))$ . By Definition 2.1 this operator acts on functions  $g : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via  $\mathcal{B}^L g = (\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda}^L + \mathcal{B}_S^L + \mathcal{B}_D^L + \mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L + \mathcal{B}_{M,\theta}^L)g$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\Lambda}^L g(n) &:= \sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} \lambda_{n,k} (g(n-k+1) - g(n)), \quad \mathcal{B}_S^L g(n) := \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell} (g(n+\ell) - g(n)), \\ \mathcal{B}_D^L g(n) &:= \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} n \beta_{\ell} (g(n+\ell-1) - g(n)), \quad \mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L g(n) := \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell} (g(n-\ell) - g(n)), \\ \mathcal{B}_{M,\theta}^L g(n) &:= n \theta (g(n-1) - g(n)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

(Recall from (2.5) that  $\sigma_{n,\ell} = \sigma_{n,\ell}^a + \sigma_{n,\ell}^A$  and  $m_{n,\ell} = m_{n,\ell}^a + m_{n,\ell}^A$ .)

We start this section with two useful lemmas about the processes  $L$  and  $V$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $g : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined via  $g(n) := n^2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . There is a constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\mathcal{B}^L g(n) \leq Cg(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Moreover, the process  $L$  is conservative.*

*Proof.* Set  $\mathcal{B}_M^L := \mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L + \mathcal{B}_{M,\theta}^L$ . We have for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda}^L g(n) \leq 0, \quad \mathcal{B}_M^L g(n) \leq 0, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_D^L g(n) = 2n^2 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_{\ell} (\ell-1) + n \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_{\ell} (\ell-1)^2 \leq 3g(n) \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_{\ell} (\ell-1)^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_S^L g(n) &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n (\ell^2 + 2n\ell) \binom{n}{\ell} |r|^{\ell} (1-|r|)^{n-\ell} \right) |r|^{-1} \mu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(-1,1)} (n|r|(1-|r|) + (n|r|)^2 + 2n^2|r|) \times |r|^{-1} \mu(dr) \\ &\leq 4n^2 \mu((-1,1)) = 4g(n) \mu((-1,1)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where we have used the definitions of  $\sigma_{n,\ell}^a$  and  $\sigma_{n,\ell}^A$  in (2.4). Therefore, setting  $C := 4\mu((-1,1)) + 3 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_{\ell} (\ell-1)^2$ , we get that  $\mathcal{B}^L g(n) \leq Cg(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Note that the function  $g$  is norm-like since  $g(n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , see [15] for the definition. Therefore  $L$  is conservative by [15, Thm. 1 (i)].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *There is a constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  we have*

$$\sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} \lambda_{n,k} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell} + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} n \beta_{\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell} + n\theta \leq Cn^2. \quad (3.4)$$

In the light of Definition 2.3, Inequality (3.4) can be rephrased by saying that: for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$  the total transition rate of the process  $V$  away from the state  $v$  is smaller than  $C(\dim(v) - 1)^2$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Using (2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} \lambda_{n,k} &= \binom{n}{2} \Lambda(\{0\}) + \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} r^k (1-r)^{n-k} \right) r^{-2} \Lambda(dr) \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \Lambda(\{0\}) + \int_{(0,1)} (1 - (1-r)^n - nr(1-r)^{n-1}) r^{-2} \Lambda(dr) \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \Lambda(\{0\}) + \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ((1-r)^k - (1-r)^{n-1}) \right) r^{-1} \Lambda(dr) \\
&\leq n^2 \Lambda(\{0\}) + n \int_{(0,1)} (1 - (1-r)^{n-1}) r^{-1} \Lambda(dr) \\
&= n^2 \Lambda(\{0\}) + n \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (1-r)^k \right) \Lambda(dr) \leq n^2 \Lambda([0,1]). \tag{3.5}
\end{aligned}$$

And, using (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} m_{n,k} &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} |r|^k (1-|r|)^{n-k} \right) |r|^{-1} \nu(dr) \\
&= \int_{(0,1)} (1 - (1-|r|)^n) |r|^{-1} \nu(dr) = \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (1-|r|)^k \right) \nu(dr) \leq n \nu((-1,1)). \tag{3.6}
\end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation shows that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell} \leq n \mu((-1,1)). \tag{3.7}$$

Combining (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) yields (3.4) with  $C := \Lambda([0,1]) + \mu((-1,1)) + \nu((-1,1)) + \theta + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell$ .  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 2.4 follows the lines of the standard proof via generators. However, the process  $V$  raises technical problems which we will circumvent using the results in [20]. To do this, we need to show that the rate matrix of the process  $V$  satisfies some properties, which we describe here in the setting of [20]. Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a countable set and  $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a rate matrix on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The required properties are encapsulated in the following condition.

**Condition 3.3.** *There is an increasing sequence  $(\mathcal{Y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  of subsets of  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $\mathcal{Y} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{Y}_n$ . There is a function  $\varphi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{w \notin \mathcal{Y}_n} \varphi(w) = \infty$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that:*

$$\sup_{w \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{w\}} Q(w, u) < \infty, n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{Y}} Q(w, u) (\varphi(u) - \varphi(w)) \leq c \varphi(w), w \in \mathcal{Y}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{w\}} Q(w, u) \leq c \varphi(w), w \in \mathcal{Y}. \tag{3.10}$$

The following lemma shows that the coefficient process  $V$  satisfies Condition 3.3, up to a restriction.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For any countable subset  $\mathcal{Y}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^\infty$  that is invariant by  $V$ , the restriction of the process  $V$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$  satisfies Condition 3.3 with the sequence  $(\mathcal{Y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  defined via  $\mathcal{Y}_n := \cup_{k \leq n} (\mathcal{Y} \cap \mathbb{R}^{k+1})$  and the function  $\varphi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  given by  $\varphi(w) := (\dim(w) - 1)^2$ . Moreover the process  $V$  is conservative.*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{Y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\varphi$  be given as in the statement of the lemma. Clearly  $\mathcal{Y} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{Y}_n$  and  $\inf_{w \notin \mathcal{Y}_n} \varphi(w) > n$ . Recall also that  $L_t = \dim(V_t) - 1$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and thus, for all  $t \geq 0$ , we have

$\varphi(V_t) = g(L_t)$  with  $g(\cdot)$  being as in Lemma 3.1. Hence, (3.9) follows from Lemma 3.1. Moreover, Lemma 3.2 implies (3.10). Finally, since  $\mathcal{Y}_n = \{w \in \mathcal{Y}, \varphi(w) \leq n^2\}$ , Condition (3.8) follows from (3.10). The fact that  $V$  is conservative follows from the results in [20] (Condition 3.3 corresponds to Condition (Q) in [20]).  $\square$

**3.2. Proof of the Bernstein duality.** In this section we prove Theorem 2.4 (Bernstein duality). We start with two lemmas that provide probabilistic arguments that will allow us to derive the duality relation at the level of the generator of  $X$  and the rate matrix of  $V$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $n \geq 0$  and  $x, r \in [0, 1]$ . We set  $(I(j))_{j \geq 0}$  and  $(R_{n,\ell,i}^a)_{\ell \in [n]_0, i \in [n+\ell]_0}$  to be collections of random variables such that  $I(j) \sim \text{Bin}(j, x)$  for all  $j \geq 0$  and  $R_{n,\ell,i}^a$  is as in Section 2.4. We also set  $J(r)$  to be a random variable such that  $J(r) \sim \text{Bin}(n, r)$ . We also assume that  $(I(j))_{j \geq 0}$ ,  $(R_{n,\ell,i}^a)_{\ell \in [n]_0, i \in [n+\ell]_0}$  and  $J(r)$  are mutually independent. Then we have*

$$R_{n,J(r),I(n+J(r))}^a \sim \text{Bin}(n, x + rx(1-x)). \quad (3.11)$$

*Proof.* Let us construct a particular realization  $Z$  of the random variable in the left-hand side of (3.11) and compute its distribution. Consider a set of  $n$  old balls numbered from 1 to  $n$ . First, let each of these balls create two new balls with probability  $r$  or only one new ball with probability  $1-r$ . Second, color each of the new balls in red with probability  $x$  and in blue with probability  $1-x$ . Third, color old balls according to the following rule: if an old ball created only one new ball, it gets the color of that ball; if an old ball created two new balls, it gets the color red if at least one of these balls is red and the color blue otherwise. We then define  $Z$  to be the number of old balls colored in red.

On the one hand, note that  $Z$  has the same distribution as the random variable in the left-hand side of (3.11). On the other hand, the colors of the  $n$  old balls are independent and each old ball is colored in red with probability

$$(1-r)x + r(1 - (1-x)^2) = (1-r)x + r(2x - x^2) = x + rx(1-x).$$

Therefore  $Z \sim \text{Bin}(n, x + rx(1-x))$ . Altogether this proves (3.11).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $n \geq 0$  and  $x, r \in [0, 1]$ . We set  $(\tilde{I}(j))_{j \geq 0}$  to be a collection of random variables such that  $\tilde{I}(j) \sim \text{Bin}(j, x)$  for all  $j \geq 0$ ,  $J(r)$  to be a random variable such that  $J(r) \sim \text{Bin}(n, r)$ , and  $(\tilde{I}(j))_{j \geq 0}$  and  $J(r)$  to be independent. Then we have*

$$\tilde{I}(n - J(r)) + J(r) \sim \text{Bin}(n, x + r(1-x)). \quad (3.12)$$

*Proof.* Let us construct a particular realization  $Z$  of the random variable in the left-hand side of (3.12) and compute its distribution. We consider a set of  $n$  balls numbered from 1 to  $n$ . We mark each of these balls with probability  $r$ , independently of each others. Each marked ball is then colored in red and each unmarked ball is colored in red with probability  $x$  and in blue with probability  $1-x$ . We then define  $Z$  to be the number of balls colored in red. On one hand, one can see that  $Z$  has the same distribution as  $\tilde{I}(n - J(r)) + J(r)$ . On the other hand, we see that the color of the  $n$  balls are independent and that each ball is colored in red with probability  $r + (1-r)x = x + r(1-x)$ , so  $Z \sim \text{Bin}(n, x + r(1-x))$ . We thus get (3.12).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Let us denote by  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  the semigroup of  $X$ , i.e. for  $f \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1])$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,  $T_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)]$ . Adapting the argument of [7, Prop. A.4] to our case we can prove that  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Feller semigroup and that the infinitesimal generator of  $X$ , that we denote by  $\mathcal{A}$ , acts on  $\mathcal{C}^2([0, 1])$  via

$$\mathcal{A}f(x) = (\mathcal{A}_\Lambda + \mathcal{A}_D + \mathcal{A}_{S^a} + \mathcal{A}_{S^A} + \mathcal{A}_{M^a} + \mathcal{A}_{M^A})f(x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\Lambda f(x) &:= \frac{\Lambda(\{0\})}{2} x(1-x)f''(x) \\ &+ \int_{(0,1]} x[f(x+r(1-x)) - f(x)] + (1-x)[f(x-rx) - f(x)] \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_D f(x) &:= d_{(\kappa, \beta, p)}(x) f'(x), \\
\mathcal{A}_{S^a} f(x) &:= \int_{(0,1)} [f(x + rx(1-x)) - f(x)] \frac{\mu(dr)}{r}, \\
\mathcal{A}_{SA} f(x) &:= \int_{(-1,0)} [f(x + rx(1-x)) - f(x)] \frac{\mu(dr)}{|r|}, \\
\mathcal{A}_{M^a} f(x) &:= \int_{(0,1)} [f(x + r(1-x)) - f(x)] \frac{\nu(dr)}{r}, \\
\mathcal{A}_{MA} f(x) &:= \int_{(-1,0)} [f(x + rx) - f(x)] \frac{\nu(dr)}{|r|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . We let  $\mathbb{M}_V^m$  be the set of matrices of size  $k \times (n+1)$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  that can be obtained as the product of a finite number of (compatible) branching, mutation and coalescence matrices (the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  identity matrix is seen as an empty product of such matrices). We denote by

$$C_V^m(v) := \{Mv \in \mathbb{R}^\infty : M \in \mathbb{M}_V^m\},$$

the set of points that can be reached by  $V$  starting from  $v$ . Note that  $C_V(a, b) \subset C_V^m((a, b)^T)$ . We note that  $C_V^m(v)$  is by definition invariant for  $V$  so that we can restrict the state space of  $V$  to  $C_V^m(v)$ . Since  $C_V^m(v)$  is countable we equip it with the discrete topology. We denote by  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  respectively the semigroup and the rate matrix of  $V$  (restricted to  $C_V^m(v)$ ), where  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined in a similar way as  $\mathcal{B}^L$ , see Section 3.1. By Definition 2.3,  $\mathcal{B}(w, \cdot)$  has finite support for all  $w \in C_V^m(v)$ . For any function  $g : C_V^m(v) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we set  $\mathcal{B}g$  to be the function defined via  $\mathcal{B}g(w) = \sum_{u \in C_V^m(v)} \mathcal{B}(w, u)(g(u) - g(w))$ . By Definition 2.3 this operator acts on functions  $g : C_V^m(v) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via

$$\mathcal{B}g(w) = (\mathcal{B}_D + \mathcal{B}_\Lambda + \mathcal{B}_{S^a} + \mathcal{B}_{SA} + \mathcal{B}_{M^a} + \mathcal{B}_{MA})g(w),$$

where for  $w \in C_V^m(v) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_D g(w) &:= n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell [g(D^{n, \ell} w) - g(w)], & \mathcal{B}_\Lambda g(w) &:= \sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} \lambda_{n, k} [g(C^{n, k} w) - g(w)], \\
\mathcal{B}_{S^a} g(w) &:= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n, \ell}^a [g(S_a^{n, \ell} w) - g(w)], & \mathcal{B}_{SA} g(w) &:= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n, \ell}^A [g(S_A^{n, \ell} w) - g(w)], \\
\mathcal{B}_{M^a} g(w) &:= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} m_{n, \ell}^a [g(M_a^{n, \ell} w) - g(w)], & \mathcal{B}_{MA} g(w) &:= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} m_{n, \ell}^A [g(M_A^{n, \ell} w) - g(w)].
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (2.6). The target duality from Theorem 2.4 can then be re-written as  $T_t H(\cdot, v)(x) = P_t H(x, \cdot)(v)$ . Using Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1], w \in C_V^m(v)} |H(x, w)| \leq \|v\|_\infty, \quad (3.13)$$

so  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  is bounded on  $[0, 1] \times C_V^m(v)$ . For any  $w \in C_V^m(v)$ ,  $x \mapsto H(x, w)$  is  $\mathcal{C}^\infty([0, 1])$  and therefore belongs to the domain of  $\mathcal{A}$ . By Lemma 3.4 the process  $V$  satisfies the Condition (Q) from [20]. According to [20, Thm. 3.1(b)] the duality  $T_t H(\cdot, v)(x) = P_t H(x, \cdot)(v)$  will follow if we can prove the duality for the operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ . More precisely, we need to prove that for  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ , we have

$$\mathcal{A}H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}H(x, \cdot)(w). \quad (3.14)$$

It was already shown in [6, Proof Thm. 2.19] that  $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_\Lambda H(x, \cdot)(w)$ . Similarly, it is not difficult to modify [6, Proof Thm. 2.19] to show that  $\mathcal{A}_D H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_D H(x, \cdot)(w)$ .

Next, we show  $\mathcal{A}_{S^a}H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_{S^a}H(x, \cdot)(w)$ . Let us fix  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ . Using the definitions of  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_{S^a}$ ,  $\sigma_{n,\ell}^a$  (see (2.4)) and  $S_a^{n,\ell}$  (see Def. 2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{S^a}H(x, \cdot)(w) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^a [H(x, S_a^{n,\ell}w) - H(x, w)] \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} [H(x, S_a^{n,\ell}w) - H(x, w)] \right) \mu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n+\ell} (S_a^{n,\ell}w)_i \binom{n+\ell}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n+\ell-i} - H(x, w) \right] \right) \mu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n+\ell} \mathbb{E} [w_{R_{n,\ell,i}^a}] \binom{n+\ell}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n+\ell-i} - H(x, w) \right] \right) \mu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \mathbb{E} [w_{R_{n,J(r),I(n+J(r))}^a}] - H(x, w) \right) r^{-1} \mu(dr), \end{aligned}$$

where the random variable  $R_{n,J(r),I(n+J(r))}^a$  in the last equality is the same as in Lemma 3.5. Using that lemma we get that this random variable has law  $\text{Bin}(n, x + rx(1-x))$  so the above equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{i=0}^n w_i \binom{n}{i} (x + rx(1-x))^i (1-x - rx(1-x))^{n-i} - H(x, w) \right) r^{-1} \mu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} (H(x + rx(1-x), w) - H(x, w)) r^{-1} \mu(dr) = \mathcal{A}_{S^a}H(\cdot, w)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definitions of  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{S^a}$ . A similar calculation leads to  $\mathcal{A}_{S^A}H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_{S^A}H(\cdot, w)(x)$ .

Next, we show  $\mathcal{A}_{M^a}H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_{M^a}H(x, \cdot)(w)$ . Let us fix  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ . Using the definitions of  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_{M^a}$  and  $m_{n,\ell}^a$  (see (2.3)) and  $M_a^{n,\ell}$  (see Def. 2.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{M^a}H(x, \cdot)(w) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} m_{n,\ell}^a [H(x, M_a^{n,\ell}w) - H(x, w)] \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} [H(x, M_a^{n,\ell}w) - H(x, w)] \right) \nu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-\ell} (M_a^{n,\ell}w)_i \binom{n-\ell}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n-\ell-i} - H(x, w) \right] \right) \nu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} r^{\ell-1} (1-r)^{n-\ell} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-\ell} w_{i+\ell} \binom{n-\ell}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n-\ell-i} - H(x, w) \right] \right) \nu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} \left( \mathbb{E} [w_{\tilde{I}(n-J(r))+J(r)}] - H(x, w) \right) r^{-1} \nu(dr), \end{aligned}$$

where the random variable  $\tilde{I}(n-J(r))+J(r)$  in the last equality is the same as in Lemma 3.6. Using that lemma we get that this random variable has law  $\text{Bin}(n, x + r(1-x))$ . In particular, the above equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{(0,1)} \left( \sum_{i=0}^n w_i \binom{n}{i} (x + r(1-x))^i (1-x - r(1-x))^{n-i} - H(x, w) \right) r^{-1} \nu(dr) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} (H(x + r(1-x), w) - H(x, w)) r^{-1} \nu(dr) = \mathcal{A}_{M^a}H(\cdot, w)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definitions of  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{M^a}$ . A similar calculation leads to  $\mathcal{A}_{M^A}H(\cdot, w)(x) = \mathcal{B}_{M^A}H(\cdot, w)(x)$ .

Altogether, this proves (3.14), which completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. Useful properties of the line-counting process  $L$ .** As mentioned in the introduction, for applications that follow, we require the process  $L$  to be positive recurrent if there are no mutations, and to be almost surely absorbed if there are mutations. We already alluded in the main result section to the fact that (2.7) provides the appropriate condition. Let us recall this. To this end, define

$$b(\beta) := \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_{\ell}(\ell-1), \quad \text{and} \quad c(\Lambda) := \int_{[0,1]} |\log(1-r)| \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2},$$

and recall that  $\theta = \theta_a + \theta_A$ . Then (2.7) reads

$$b(\beta) + \mu(-1, 1) < c(\Lambda) + \nu(-1, 1) + \theta.$$

In the remainder of this section, we will show, using ideas developed in [8], that under (2.7) the process  $L$  is either positive recurrent or almost surely absorbed in finite time. Define  $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(n) &:= \binom{n}{2} \Lambda(\{0\}) - n \int_{(0,1]} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n}(nr - 1 + (1-r)^n) \right) \frac{\Lambda(dr)}{r^2}, \\ f(\ell) &:= \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} \frac{k}{\delta(k)} \log \left( \frac{k}{k-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma is a generalisation of [8, Lemma 2.3], which corresponds to the case  $\beta_2 > 0$ ,  $\beta_{\ell} = 0$  for  $\ell \neq 2$ , and  $p_{1,2} = 0$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Recall that  $\mathcal{B}^L$ , defined in Section 3.1, is the rate matrix of the process  $L$ . Assume that (2.7) is satisfied. Then there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$*

$$\mathcal{B}^L f(n) \leq -1 + \frac{b(\beta) + \mu(-1, 1) - (\nu(-1, 1) + \theta)}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon (b(\beta) + \mu(-1, 1)) < 0,$$

with the usual convention that  $1/\infty = 0$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $\mathcal{B}^L = (\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda}^L + \mathcal{B}_S^L + \mathcal{B}_D^L + \mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L + \mathcal{B}_{M,\theta}^L)$  with the building blocks defined in (3.1). In the proof of [6, Lemma 5.3] it was shown that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$

$$\frac{n}{\delta(n)} \leq \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda}^L + \mathcal{B}_D^L) f(n) \leq -1 + \frac{b(\beta)}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon b(\beta). \quad (3.15)$$

Moreover, the function  $n \mapsto n/\delta(n)$  is non-increasing and converging to  $1/c(\Lambda)$ . In particular, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \leq \frac{n}{\delta(n)}. \quad (3.16)$$

Let us now see the effect of the other operators. First note that, using (3.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{M,\theta}^L f(n) &= n\theta(f(n-1) - f(n)) = -n\theta \frac{n}{\delta(n)} \log \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \right) \\ &\leq n \frac{\theta}{c(\Lambda)} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \leq -\frac{\theta}{c(\Lambda)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Similarly, for  $k \in [n]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(n-k) - f(n) &= - \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n \frac{j}{\delta(j)} \log \left( \frac{j}{j-1} \right) \leq -\frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n \log \left( \frac{j}{j-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \log \left( 1 - \frac{k}{n} \right) \leq -\frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \frac{k}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using that  $\binom{n}{k} \frac{k}{n} = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L f(n) &\leq -\frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \int_{(-1,1)} \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n-1}{k-1} |r|^{k-1} (1-|r|)^{n-k} \nu(dr) \\ &= -\frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} \int_{(-1,1)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} |r|^k (1-|r|)^{n-1-k} \nu(dr) = -\frac{\nu(-1,1)}{c(\Lambda)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Finally, let us consider  $\mathcal{B}_S^L$ . To this end, note that for  $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} f(n+\ell) - f(n) &= \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+\ell} \frac{j}{\delta(j)} \log \left( \frac{j}{j-1} \right) \leq \left( \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon \right) \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+\ell} \log \left( \frac{j}{j-1} \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon \right) \log \left( 1 + \frac{\ell}{n} \right) \leq \left( \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon \right) \frac{\ell}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, proceeding as for  $\mathcal{B}_{M,\nu}^L f(n)$ , we get

$$\mathcal{B}_S^L f(n) \leq \left( \frac{1}{c(\Lambda)} + \varepsilon \right) \mu(-1,1). \quad (3.19)$$

The first inequality in the statement follows combining (3.15), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19). Since under (2.7), we have

$$-1 + \frac{b(\beta) + \mu(-1,1) - (\nu(-1,1) + \theta)}{c(\Lambda)} < 0,$$

the second inequality follows by choosing first  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small so that the middle term is strictly smaller than 0 and then choosing  $n_0$  for that choice of  $\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Assume (2.7) is satisfied. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) *If  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , then 1 is positive recurrent for  $L$ .*
- (2) *If  $\vec{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$ , then  $L$  is absorbed in 0 in finite time.*

*Proof.* Let

$$T^{(n)} := \inf\{s \geq 0 : L_s < n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since the process  $L$  is conservative by Lemma 3.1 and  $f$  is bounded,  $(f, \mathcal{B}^L f)$  is in the full generator. Thus, we can use Lemma 3.7 and proceed analogously to the proof of [6, Lemma 5.4] (see also [8, Lemma 2.4]), to show that there is  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_n[T^{(n_0)}] < cf(n), \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (3.20)$$

Note that one can easily construct  $p \in (0, 1)$  such that every time the process  $L$  enters  $[n_0]_0$  the probability that  $L$  hits 0/1 before leaving  $[n_0]_0$  is at least  $p$ . In the case without mutations, we choose  $p$  as the probability of going from  $n_0$  to 1 by consecutive coalescences; in the case with mutations we choose  $p$  as the probability of going from  $n_0$  to 0 by consecutive mutations. Considering the possible transitions of the line-counting process  $L$ , we see that, directly upon leaving  $[n_0]_0$ ,  $L$  arrives in the finite set  $\{n_0+1, \dots, n_1\}$  where  $n_1 := 2n_0 \vee (n_0 + \kappa)$ . This and (3.20) show that, every time  $L$  leaves  $[n_0]_0$ , the return time to  $[n_0]_0$  has finite expectation. Combining both arguments, we obtain that in the case without (resp. with) mutations the expectation of the hitting time of 1 (resp. 0) by  $L$  is finite under  $\mathbb{P}_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, 1 is positive recurrent for  $L$  in case (1) and  $L$  is absorbed in 0 in finite time in case (2).  $\square$

## 4. PROOF OF OTHER MAIN RESULTS

**4.1. Properties of the Bernstein coefficient process: Proof of Propositions 2.6 and 2.11.** We now use the results from Section 3 to prove the properties of the Bernstein coefficient process stated in Section 2.5. We start with the following lemma, which provides some basic properties of the operators introduced in Definition 2.2.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then for any  $\ell \in [\kappa]$ ,  $k \in [n]$  and  $j \in [n]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} (D^{n,\ell}v)_0 &= (C^{n,k}v)_0 = (S_a^{n,j}v)_0 = (S_A^{n,j}v)_0 = v_0 \\ (D^{n,\ell}v)_{n+\ell-1} &= (C^{n,k}v)_{n-k+1} = (S_a^{n,j}v)_{n+j} = (S_A^{n,j}v)_{n+j} = v_n. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for  $\ell \in [\kappa]$ ,  $k \in [n]$  and  $j \in [n]$ ,

$$\|C^{n,k}v\|_\infty, \|S_a^{n,j}v\|_\infty, \|S_A^{n,j}v\|_\infty, \|M_a^{n,j}v\|_\infty, \|M_A^{n,j}v\|_\infty, \|D^{n,\ell}v\|_\infty \leq \|v\|_\infty.$$

*Proof.* The result follows in a straightforward way from the definition of the operators.  $\square$

*Proof of Propositions 2.6 and 2.11.* Proposition 2.11 follows directly from Lemma 3.8. We now assume that  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$  and we prove Proposition 2.6. Lemma 4.1 yields directly that the functions  $t \mapsto V_t(0)$  and  $t \mapsto V_t(L_t)$  are constant. In particular, the restriction of  $V$  to  $C_V(a, b)$  is an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain. Indeed, for  $w, w' \in C_V(a, b)$  to go from  $w$  to  $w'$ , first go from  $w$  to  $(a, b)^T$  by successive coalescence operations. Then go from  $(a, b)^T$  to  $w'$  in a finite number of successive selection and coalescence operations. Let us assume now (2.7) is satisfied.

(1) By Lemma 3.8, (2.7) implies that 1 is positive recurrent for  $L$ . Since, in addition, the functions  $t \mapsto V_t(0)$  and  $t \mapsto V_t(L_t)$  are constant, the state  $(a, b)^T$  is positive recurrent for  $V$ . Thus, the restriction of  $V$  to  $C_V(a, b)$  is positive recurrent, and hence it admits a unique invariant distribution  $\mu^{a,b}$  [17, Thm. 3.5.2, Thm. 3.5.3]. It remains to show that  $\mu^{a,b}$  is the unique stationary distribution of  $V$  with support included in  $\widehat{C}_V(a, b) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty : v_0 = a, v_{\dim(v)-1} = b\}$ . This follows directly noting that, since 1 is positive recurrent for  $L$ , the process  $V$  starting in  $V_0 = v \in \widehat{C}_V(a, b)$  enters  $C_V(a, b)$  in finite time.

(2) Let  $V_\infty^{a,b} \sim \mu^{a,b}$ . If  $V_0 = (a, b)^T$ , then  $V_t \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} V_\infty^{a,b}$  in law by classic Markov chain theory [17, Thm. 3.6.2]. On the other hand, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  with  $v_0 = a$  and  $v_n = b$ , as remarked above,  $V$  enters  $C_V(a, b)$  in finite time. Hence, the result of Proposition 2.6 follows.  $\square$

**4.2. The case without mutation: Proof of Theorem 2.7.** In this section we assume  $\vec{\theta} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$  and study fixation and extinction.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assume  $\vec{\theta} = 0$ ,  $\nu = 0$  and that (2.7) is satisfied. Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be defined by  $f(x) := \mathbb{E}[H(x, V_\infty^{0,1})]$ , where the random variable  $V_\infty^{0,1}$  is as in Proposition 2.6. For any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $k \geq 1$ , we have*

$$f(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_k}[H(x, V_t)]. \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover  $f$  is continuous and satisfies  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f(1) = 1$  and  $f(x) \in (0, 1)$  for  $x \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* For the choice  $V_0 = e_k$  note that we have a.s.  $V_t \in C_V(0, 1)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . By Proposition 2.6,  $V_t$  converges in distribution to  $V_\infty^{0,1}$ . By (3.13) we moreover have that, for any  $x, v \in [0, 1] \times C_V(0, 1)$ ,  $|H(x, v)| \leq 1$ . By the continuous mapping theorem we get (4.1). Note that we have a.s.  $V_\infty^{0,1} \in C_V(0, 1)$ . Since the mapping  $x \mapsto H(x, v)$  is continuous for any  $v \in C_V(0, 1)$ , and  $|H(x, v)| \leq 1$  for any  $x, v \in [0, 1] \times C_V(0, 1)$ , we get by dominated convergence that  $f$  is continuous. It is plain that for any  $v \in C_V(0, 1)$ ,  $H(0, v) = 0$  and  $H(1, v) = 1$ , so  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f(1) = 1$ . We now justify that  $f(x) \in (0, 1)$  for  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Note that for  $v = e_1$  we have  $H(x, v) = x$ . Moreover, by (1) from the proof of Propositions 2.6 and 2.11 we see that the state  $e_1$  is positive recurrent for  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$  started at  $e_1$ , so  $\mathbb{P}(V_\infty^{0,1} = e_1) > 0$ . We have

$$f(x) = x \mathbb{P}(V_\infty^{0,1} = e_1) + \sum_{v \in C_V(0,1) \setminus \{e_1\}} H(x, v) \mathbb{P}(V_\infty^{0,1} = v). \quad (4.2)$$

For any  $x, v \in [0, 1] \times C_V(0, 1)$  we have  $H(x, v) \in [0, 1]$  (because  $|H(x, v)| \leq 1$  and  $H(x, v) \geq 0$ ). Since  $\sum_{v \in C_V(0,1)} \mathbb{P}(V_\infty^{0,1} = v) = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}(V_\infty^{0,1} = e_1) > 0$ , we get from (4.2) that  $f(x) \in (0, 1)$  for  $x \in (0, 1)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.7.* Let  $f$  be as in Lemma 4.2. Let us show that  $(f(X_t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a bounded martingale. To this end, we use the Markov property for  $X$ , Lemma 4.2, dominated convergence (which can be used since, by (3.13), we have  $|\mathbb{E}_{e_1}[H(\tilde{X}_s, V_h)]| \leq \|e_1\|_\infty = 1$ ), Fubini's theorem, Theorem 2.4, and the Markov property for  $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_{t+s}) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathbb{E}_{X_t}[f(\tilde{X}_s)] = \mathbb{E}_{X_t}[\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_1}[H(\tilde{X}_s, V_h)]] = \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{X_t}[\mathbb{E}_{e_1}[H(\tilde{X}_s, V_h)]] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_1}[\mathbb{E}_{X_t}[H(\tilde{X}_s, V_h)]] = \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_1}[\mathbb{E}_{V_h}[H(X_t, \tilde{V}_s)]] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_1}[H(X_t, \tilde{V}_{h+s})] = f(X_t). \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Doob's martingale convergence theorem,  $F := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(X_t)$  exists almost surely. Using Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 4.2 we get

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_t^k] = \mathbb{E}_x[H(X_t, e_k)] = \mathbb{E}_{e_k}[H(x, V_t)] \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} f(x).$$

Therefore the positive integer moments of  $X_t$  converge to the moments of the distribution  $\text{Bin}(1, f(x))$ . Probability distributions on  $[0, 1]$  are completely determined by their positive integer moments, and convergence of those moments imply convergence in distribution. We thus get that the law of  $X_t$  converges weakly to  $\text{Bin}(1, f(x))$ . Since, by Lemma 4.2,  $f$  is continuous and satisfies  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f(1) = 1$ , we get by the continuous mapping theorem that the law of  $f(X_t)$  converges weakly to  $\text{Bin}(1, f(x))$ . Combining with the above almost sure convergence of  $f(X_t)$ , we get  $F \sim \text{Bin}(1, f(x))$ ; so in particular  $F \in \{0, 1\}$  a.s. Let us show that  $X_t$  converges to  $F$  almost surely. Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ . Since, by Lemma 4.2,  $f$  is continuous, positive on  $(0, 1]$ , and strictly smaller than 1 on  $[0, 1)$ , we have  $\delta(\epsilon) := \min\{\min_{z \in [\epsilon, 1]} f(z), 1 - \max_{z \in [0, 1-\epsilon]} f(z)\} > 0$ . Since  $f(X_t)$  converges to  $F$  almost surely, there exists almost surely  $T(\epsilon)$  such that  $|f(X_t) - F| < \delta(\epsilon)$  for all  $t \geq T(\epsilon)$ . Distinguishing the cases  $F = 0$  and  $F = 1$  we see that this is possible only if  $|X_t - F| < \epsilon$  for all  $t \geq T(\epsilon)$ . In conclusion,  $\mathbb{P}(|X_t - F| < \epsilon \text{ for all large } t) = 1$ . Since this is true for all  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2) \cap \mathbb{Q}$  we get that  $X_t$  converges almost surely to  $F$ . This proves that the first claim holds with  $X_\infty = F$ . Finally, (2.8) follows from  $F \sim \text{Bin}(1, f(x))$  and Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

**4.3. The case with mutations: Proof of Theorem 2.12 and Proposition 2.13.** In this section we assume  $\bar{\theta} \neq 0$  or  $\nu \neq 0$  and study the ergodicity of  $X$  and its stationary distribution.

*Proof of Theorem 2.12.* Let  $\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 : L_t = 0\}$ . According to Proposition 2.11 we have  $\mathbb{P}_v$ -a.s. that for any starting value  $v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ ,  $\tau < \infty$  and, for  $t \geq \tau$ ,  $\dim(V_t) = 1$  and  $V_t = V_\tau = (V_\infty)$ . In particular, for any  $x \in (0, 1)$ ,  $H(x, V_t)$  converges  $\mathbb{P}_v$ -a.s. towards  $H(x, V_\tau) = V_\infty$ . Moreover, for all  $t \geq 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_v$ -a.s.  $|H(x, V_t)| \leq \|v\|_\infty$  by (3.13). Using Theorem 2.4 and dominated convergence, we thus get

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_t^k] = \mathbb{E}_x[H(X_t, e_k)] = \mathbb{E}_{e_k}[H(x, V_t)] \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{e_k}[V_\infty]. \quad (4.3)$$

Therefore, all positive integer moments of  $X_t$  converge to a limit (which does not depend on the initial condition  $x$ ) as  $t$  goes to infinity. Probability distributions on  $[0, 1]$  are completely determined by their positive integer moments, and convergence of those moments imply convergence in distribution. Therefore, there is a probability distribution  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $[0, 1]$  such that for any  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the law of  $X_t$  under  $\mathbb{P}_x$  converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{L}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and the moments of this law are given by (2.12). By dominated convergence, the convergence of the law of  $X_t$  towards  $\mathcal{L}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  extends to any distribution on  $(0, 1)$  for  $X_0$ . Therefore,  $X$  admits a unique stationary distribution which is given by  $\mathcal{L}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** In (2.12), the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_v[V_\infty]$  is expressed in terms of the sequence  $(\rho_k)_{k \geq 1}$  when  $v = e_n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . In order to prove Proposition 2.13, we need such an expression for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ . Letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in Theorem 2.4 with  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and using Theorem 2.12, Proposition 2.11 and dominated convergence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_v[V_\infty] &= \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} v(i) \int_{[0,1]} z^i (1-z)^{n-i} \mathcal{L}(dz) = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n-i}{j} (-1)^j v(i) \rho_{i+j} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=i}^n \binom{n}{i} \binom{n-i}{k-i} (-1)^{k-i} v(i) \rho_k = \sum_{k=0}^n \left( \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i} \binom{n-i}{k-i} (-1)^{k-i} v(i) \right) \rho_k. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.13.* Recall the transitions of the process  $V$  given in Definition 2.3 and the definition of  $\alpha_n$  in the statement of the proposition. Let  $n \geq 1$ . A first step decomposition of  $V$  started at  $V_0 = e_n$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n \mathbb{E}_{e_n}[V_\infty] &= \sum_{\ell=2}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \lambda_{n,\ell} \mathbb{E}_{C^{n,\ell} e_n}[V_\infty] + n \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell \mathbb{E}_{D^{n,\ell} e_n}[V_\infty] \\ &+ \sum_{c \in \{a,A\}} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^c \mathbb{E}_{S_c^{n,\ell} e_n}[V_\infty] + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} (m_{n,\ell}^c + \theta_c \mathbb{1}_{\ell=1}) \mathbb{E}_{M_c^{n,\ell} e_n}[V_\infty] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, from Definition 2.2, we see that

$$C^{n,\ell} e_n = e_{n-\ell+1}, \quad S_A^{n,\ell} e_n = e_{n+\ell}, \quad M_a^{n,\ell} e_n = e_{n-\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad M_A^{n,\ell} e_n = 0.$$

Let us now compute  $S_a^{n,\ell} e_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n+\ell+1}$ . For  $\ell \in [n]$  and  $i \in [n+\ell]$ , consider the ASG starting with  $n$  lines and having a simultaneous  $a$ -branching involving  $\ell$  lines as a first transition. Draw uniformly at random (without replacement)  $i$  from the  $n+\ell$  lines and assign them type  $a$ ; assign type  $A$  to the other  $n+\ell-i$  lines. Propagate the types to the  $n$  initial lines following the propagation rules in the ASG (see Section 2.3). Then  $(S_a^{n,\ell} e_n)_i$  can be interpreted as the probability of the event where all the  $n$  initial lines receive type  $a$ . The event occurs if and only if, during the type-assignment, 1) the  $n-\ell$  lines not resulting from the branching all receive type  $a$  and 2) in each of the  $\ell$  pairs of lines resulting from the branching, at most one line receives type  $A$ . In particular, the event can occur only if there are at most  $\ell$  lines receiving type  $A$ , that is, if  $n+\ell-i \leq \ell$ . We thus get  $(S_a^{n,\ell} e_n)_i = 0$  for  $i < n$ . When  $i \in \{n, \dots, n+\ell\}$ , for the event to be realized, there are  $\binom{\ell}{n+\ell-i}$  choices to distribute the type  $A$  in the pairs and then  $2^{n+\ell-i}$  for the choices of type  $A$  lines within those pairs. The total number of choices to distribute the type  $A$  among all lines is  $\binom{n+\ell}{n+\ell-i}$ . Thus,

$$(S_a^{n,\ell} e_n)_i = 2^{n+\ell-i} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-i} / \binom{n+\ell}{n+\ell-i}, \quad \text{for } i \in \{n, \dots, n+\ell\}.$$

Next, we compute  $D^{n,\ell} e_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n+\ell}$ . For  $\ell \in [\kappa]$  and  $i \in [n+\ell-1]_0$ , consider the ASG starting with  $n$  lines and having a selective branching where a line splits into  $\ell$  as a first transition. Draw uniformly at random (without replacement)  $i$  from the  $n+\ell-1$  lines and assign them type  $a$ ; assign type  $A$  to the other  $n+\ell-1-i$  lines. Propagate the types to the  $n$  initial lines following the propagation rules in the ASG (see Section 2.3). Then  $(D^{n,\ell} e_n)_i$  can be interpreted as the probability of the event where all the  $n$  initial lines receive type  $a$ . The event can occur only if all  $n+\ell-1-i$  lines receiving type  $A$  are among the  $\ell$  lines resulting from the branching and if they do not represent all of those  $\ell$  lines (because  $p_0^{(\ell)} = 0$ ). We thus get  $(D^{n,\ell} e_n)_i = 0$  for  $i < n$ . When  $i \in \{n, \dots, n+\ell-1\}$ , for the event to be realized, there are  $\binom{\ell}{n+\ell-1-i}$  choices to distribute the type  $A$  into the  $\ell$  lines resulting from the branching. In each of these possibilities, the line at the source of the branching receives type  $a$  with probability  $p_{i+1-n}^{(\ell)}$  and all other lines receive type  $a$ . The total number of choices to distribute the type  $A$  among all lines is  $\binom{n+\ell-1}{n+\ell-1-i}$ . Hence, we infer that

$$(D^{n,\ell} e_n)_i = p_{i+1-n}^{(\ell)} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-1-i} / \binom{n+\ell-1}{n+\ell-1-i}, \quad \text{for } i \in \{n, \dots, n+\ell-1\}.$$

Plugging the obtained expressions of  $C^{n,\ell} e_n$ ,  $S_A^{n,\ell} e_n$ ,  $M_a^{n,\ell} e_n$ ,  $M_A^{n,\ell} e_n$ ,  $S_a^{n,\ell} e_n$  and  $D^{n,\ell} e_n$  into (4.5) and combining with (2.12) and (4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n \rho_n &= \sum_{\ell=2}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \lambda_{n,\ell} \rho_{n-\ell+1} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^A \rho_{n+\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} (m_{n,\ell}^a + \theta_a \mathbb{1}_{\ell=1}) \rho_{n-\ell} \\ &+ n \sum_{\ell=2}^{\kappa} \beta_\ell \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} \left( \sum_{i=n}^k (-1)^{k-i} p_{i+1-n}^{(\ell)} \frac{\binom{n+\ell-1}{i} \binom{n+\ell-1-i}{k-i} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-1-i}}{\binom{n+\ell-1}{n+\ell-1-i}} \right) \rho_k \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=1}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^a \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell} \left( \sum_{i=n}^k (-1)^{k-i} 2^{n+\ell-i} \frac{\binom{n+\ell}{i} \binom{n+\ell-i}{k-i} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-i}}{\binom{n+\ell}{n+\ell-i}} \right) \rho_k. \end{aligned}$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n \rho_n &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k-1} \lambda_{n,n-k+1} \rho_k + \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \binom{n}{k-n} \sigma_{n,k-n}^A \rho_k + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} (m_{n,n-k}^a + \theta_a \mathbf{1}_{k=n-1}) \rho_k \\ &+ \sum_{k=n}^{n+\kappa-1} \left( \sum_{\ell=2\nu(k+1-n)}^{\kappa} n \beta_\ell \sum_{i=n}^k (-1)^{k-i} p_{i+1-n}^{(\ell)} \frac{\binom{n+\ell-1}{i} \binom{n+\ell-1-i}{k-i} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-1-i}}{\binom{n+\ell-1}{n+\ell-1-i}} \right) \rho_k \\ &+ \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \left( \sum_{\ell=1\nu(k-n)}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \sigma_{n,\ell}^a \sum_{i=n}^k (-1)^{k-i} 2^{n+\ell-i} \frac{\binom{n+\ell}{i} \binom{n+\ell-i}{k-i} \binom{\ell}{n+\ell-i}}{\binom{n+\ell}{n+\ell-i}} \right) \rho_k. \end{aligned}$$

Re-arranging terms we get (2.13). □

**Acknowledgment.** Fernando Cordero was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) — Project-ID 317210226 — SFB 1283.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. Baake and A. Wakolbinger. Lines of descent under selection. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 172(1):156–174, Jul 2018. ISSN 1572-9613.
- [2] E. Baake, L. Esercito, and S. Hummel. Lines of descent in a Moran model with frequency-dependent selection and mutation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 160:409–457, 2023.
- [3] B. Bah and E. Pardoux. The  $\Lambda$ -lookdown model with selection. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 125:1089–1126, 2015.
- [4] V. Bansaye, M.-E. Caballero, and S. Méléard. Scaling limits of population and evolution processes in random environment. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 24(19):1–38, 2019.
- [5] F. Cordero and G. Véchambre. Moran models and Wright–Fisher diffusions with selection and mutation in a one-sided random environment. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, pages 1–67, 2023. doi: 10.1017/apr.2022.54.
- [6] F. Cordero, S. Hummel, and E. Schertzer. General selection models: Bernstein duality and minimal ancestral structures. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(3):1499 – 1556, 2022. doi: 10.1214/21-AAP1683.
- [7] F. Cordero, S. Hummel, and G. Véchambre.  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher processes with general selection and opposing environmental effects: fixation and coexistence. *arXiv e-prints*, 2023+.
- [8] C. Foucart. The impact of selection in the  $\Lambda$ -Wright–Fisher model. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 18: no. 72, 10 pp., 2013.
- [9] A. González Casanova and D. Spanò. Duality and fixation in  $\Xi$ -Wright–Fisher processes with frequency-dependent selection. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 28:250–284, 2018.
- [10] A. González Casanova, D. Spanò, and M. Wilke-Berenguer. The effective strength of selection in random environment. *arXiv e-prints*, 2019.
- [11] A. González Casanova, N. Kurt, and A. Tobias. Particle systems with coordination. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 18:1817–1844, 2021.
- [12] R. C. Griffiths. The  $\Lambda$ -Fleming–Viot process and a connection with Wright–Fisher diffusion. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 46:1009–1035, 2014.
- [13] J. Koskela, K. Łatuszyński, and D. Spanò. Bernoulli factories and duality in Wright–Fisher and Allen–Cahn models of population genetics. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 156:40–45, 2024. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tpb.2024.01.002>.
- [14] S. M. Krone and C. Neuhauser. Ancestral processes with selection. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 51(3): 210–237, 1997.
- [15] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. A Survey of Foster–Lyapunov Techniques for General State Space Markov Processes. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Stochastic Stability and Stochastic Stabilization*, volume 9, 1993.
- [16] C. Neuhauser and S. M. Krone. The genealogy of samples in models with selection. *Genetics*, 145(2):519–534, February 1997.
- [17] J. R. Norris. *Markov Chains, 2nd ed.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.

- [18] D. Siegmund. The Equivalence of Absorbing and Reflecting Barrier Problems for Stochastically Monotone Markov Processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 4(6):914 – 924, 1976.
- [19] G. Véchambre. Combinatorics of ancestral lines for a Wright–Fisher diffusion with selection in a Lévy environment. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(6A):4875–4935, 2023.
- [20] A. Voss-Bohme, W. Schenk, and A.-K. Koellner. On the Equivalence Between Liggett Duality of Markov Processes and the Duality Relation Between Their Generators. *Markov Process. Relat. Fields*, 17(3):315–346, 2011.

<sup>1</sup>FACULTY OF TECHNOLOGY, BIELEFELD UNIVERSITY, BOX 100131, 33501 BIELEFELD, GERMANY

<sup>2</sup>BOKU UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY RESEARCH, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, GREGOR-MENDEL-STRASSE 33, 1180 VIENNA, AUSTRIA

<sup>3</sup>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ETH ZÜRICH, ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

<sup>4</sup>ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, NO. 55, ZHONGGUANCUN EAST ROAD, HAIDIAN DISTRICT, BEIJING, CHINA

*Email address:* <sup>1</sup>fcordero@techfak.uni-bielefeld.de, <sup>2</sup>fernando.cordero@boku.ac.at, <sup>3</sup>shummel@hest.ethz.ch, <sup>4</sup>vechambre@amss.ac.cn