Published in final edited form as:

Phys Rev Lett. 2010 December 10; 105(24): 248104.

Sources and sinks: a stochastic model of evolution in heterogeneous environments

Rutger Hermesen and Terence Hwa*

Center for Theoretical Biological Physics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

Abstract

We study evolution driven by spatial heterogeneity in a stochastic model of source-sink ecologies. A sink is a habitat where mortality exceeds reproduction so that a local population persists only due to immigration from a source. Immigrants can, however, adapt to conditions in the sink by mutation. To characterize the adaptation rate, we derive expressions for the first arrival time of adapted mutants. The joint effects of migration, mutation, birth and death result in two distinct parameter regimes. These results may pertain to the rapid evolution of drug-resistant pathogens and insects.

Biological evolution and ecology are intimately linked, because the reproductive success or “fitness” of an organism depends crucially on its ecosystem. The biotic and abiotic factors defining an ecosystem often have complex time- and space-dependent dynamics [1]. Yet, most models of evolution describe homogeneous, fixed-size populations subjected to a constant selection pressure [2]. Even though such minimal descriptions have lead to invaluable insights into some of the major evolutionary forces [2], their scope is clearly limited. An important challenge in evolutionary biology is therefore to understand the interaction between ecology and evolution.

In this Letter, we study how spatial heterogeneities can drive evolution in ecologies displaying so-called source–sink dynamics (SSD) [3–6]. A species’ habitat is called a *sink* if the local mortality exceeds the local reproduction so that a population can persist only due to continuous immigration from a *source* habitat, where reproduction exceeds mortality. Sinks often occur at the border of a species’ range: if an environmental variable such as temperature or humidity varies in space and limits a species’ range, the conditions at the border are often poor. SSD results in a sustained presence of poorly adapted immigrants in the sink; this suggests that it could assist adaptation to the sink conditions. Immigrants that, due to mutations, acquire the ability to reproduce efficiently in the sink have an opportunity to establish a population there. Such a mutant can be successful even if it does not have a competitive advantage in its original habitat (the source); it is sufficient if the mutation allows it to colonize the sink. Importantly, this adaptive process driven by the opportunity to

*hwa@ucsd.edu.

PACS numbers: 87.23.Cc, 87.23.Kg, 87.10.Mn

establish a new niche is qualitatively different from the conventional notion of a population climbing a fitness gradient [7, 8].

Evolution in source-sink systems is not merely of theoretical interest. For instance, SSD may accelerate the evolution of drug resistance in bacteria [9]. In humans or livestock treated with antibiotics, drug levels can vary between different organs, creating sources and sinks within a host [10]. Also, SSD can emerge when bacteria migrate between treated and untreated individuals [9]. Likewise, the migration of fruit flies between plantations using different (amounts of) insecticides could assist the emergence of insecticide resistance [11, 12]. The evolution of virulence has been associated with SSD as well [13-15].

Here we analyze a minimal stochastic model of adaptation driven by SSD. In particular, we study how the rate of adaptation depends on parameters such as migration and mutation rates. Earlier studies examined source-sink systems from various perspectives. Although the models proposed differ from each other in various respects, they can be divided into three classes. First, several models are based on deterministic population dynamics [16-21]. Such models are convenient but ignore the intrinsic stochasticity of the demographic processes, which, as we will see below, can be important. Second, some studies employ the formalism of quantitative genetics [22, 23]. This type of models describes the response of a quantitative trait to selection in a population characterized by a distribution of phenotypes. This line of attack is appropriate only for multi-locus traits and is again deterministic. Third, individual-based simulations have been used [24]. Unfortunately, such studies are necessarily limited to a narrow set of parameters. In contrast, our model is fully stochastic and yields analytical results that are valid for a wide range of parameter values.

We consider a haploid population in an environment consisting of two “patches” (Fig. 1(a)). Individuals migrate between the patches at a rate ν and die at a rate δ . Each organism has one of two possible genotypes, called “wild-type” (w) and “mutant” (m). Mutations turn a wild-type into a mutant at a rate μ_f ; the reverse occurs at a rate μ_b . The reproduction rate of genotype $g \in \{W, M\}$ in patch i obeys the logistic form $\gamma_{ig}(N_i) \equiv \max \{r_{ig}(1 - N_i/K), 0\}$, where N_i is the population size in patch i . The logistic form keeps N_i finite and introduces competition between organisms sharing a patch. K is called the carrying capacity and r_{ig} is the maximal reproduction rate of type g in patch i . The wild-type can reproduce in patch 1 but not in patch 2 ($r_{2w} = 0$); this introduces SSD. By contrast, mutants can reproduce in *both* patches. We initially choose $r_{1w} = r_{1M} \equiv r$, so that both types are equally “fit” in patch 1. Later we will relax this to consider the effect of a possible fitness cost conferred by the mutation.

We make a few biologically motivated assumptions. First, we limit our analysis to large populations ($K \gg 1$). Second, we assume that mutation rates are low ($\mu_b, \mu_f \ll \nu, \delta$). Third, we assume that $\nu < \delta$, *i.e.*, organisms are unlikely to migrate multiple times within their lifetime.

The adaptation process consists of two parts. First a mutant has to appear in the sink; next this mutant has to establish a population. The latter process has been treated by (stochastic)

models of colony growth [18, 19, 25]. We therefore focus on the question how long it takes before the first mutant arrives in patch 2 starting from a wild-type population in patch 1.

Fig. 1(b) shows the two pathways that can generate a mutant in patch 2. In the upper path (denoted by $\uparrow$) first a mutation occurs in patch 1 and later a mutant migrates to patch 2. In the lower path, $\rightarrow$, a wild-type first migrates to patch 2 and then mutates. A priori it is unclear which path is more likely. Below, we derive the first arrival time (FAT) distributions for both paths.

We start with path $\uparrow$. Let n_{ig} be the number of organisms with genotype g in patch i . Since $K \gg 1$, $N_1 \equiv n_{1w} + n_{1M}$ is approximately constant; it fluctuates around the value $N \equiv [1 - (\delta + \nu)/r]K$ for which the reproduction rate equals the rate at which organisms disappear from the first patch ($\gamma_{1M}(N) = \delta + \nu$) [26]. Below, we assume that $N_1 = N$; this allows us to study path $\uparrow$ in isolation. We write a Master Equation for the probability $P_{\uparrow}(n, t)$ that at time t no mutant has yet migrated to patch 2 and n_{1M} has value n . It reads

$$\partial_t P_{\uparrow}(n, t) = w^-(n+1) P_{\uparrow}(n+1, t) + w^+(n-1) P_{\uparrow}(n-1, t) - [w^-(n) + w^+(n) + u(n)] P_{\uparrow}(n, t), \quad (1)$$

with $w^- \equiv (\delta + \mu_b)n$, $w^+(n) \equiv \gamma_{1M}(N)n + \mu_f(N-n)$, $u(n) = \nu$ and initial condition $P_{\uparrow}(n, 0) = \delta_{n,0}$ ($\delta_{n,m}$ is the Kronecker delta function).

We rewrite Eq. 1 in terms of the generating function $G_{\uparrow}(z, t) \equiv \sum_n z^n P_{\uparrow}(n, t)$ and solve the resulting partial differential equation. The probability that at time t no mutant has migrated yet, $S_{\uparrow}(t) = G_{\uparrow}(1, t)$, follows as

$$S_{\uparrow}(t) = \left[\frac{c_{\uparrow} e^{b_{\uparrow} t}}{c_{\uparrow} \cosh(c_{\uparrow} t) + b_{\uparrow} \sinh(c_{\uparrow} t)} \right]^{a_{\uparrow}}, \quad (2)$$

with $a_{\uparrow} \equiv \mu_f N / (\delta + \nu - \mu_f)$, $b_{\uparrow} \equiv (\mu_b + \mu_f)/2$, and $c_{\uparrow} \equiv [b_{\uparrow}^2 + \nu(\delta + \nu - \mu_f)]^{1/2}$. Now the desired FAT probability density $F_{\uparrow}(t) \equiv -dS_{\uparrow}(t)/dt$ can be expressed as

$$F_{\uparrow}(t) = \nu \langle n_{1M}(t) \rangle S_{\uparrow}(t), \quad (3)$$

where $\langle n_{1M}(t) \rangle$ is the mean value of n_{1M} at time t given that no mutant has migrated yet; it obeys

$$\langle n_{1M}(t) \rangle = \frac{\mu_f N}{c_{\uparrow} + b_{\uparrow}} \frac{\tanh(c_{\uparrow} t)}{\tanh(c_{\uparrow} t)}. \quad (4)$$

These results show that path $\uparrow$ is governed by two time scales. First, $\langle n_{1M}(t) \rangle$ builds up in a time scale $\tau_{\uparrow} = 1/2c_{\uparrow}$. Second, at large times $F_{\uparrow}(t)$ decays with time scale

$\tau'_{\uparrow} = [a_{\uparrow}(c_{\uparrow} - b_{\uparrow})]^{-1}$ due to the time dependence of $S_{\uparrow}(t)$; this time scale reflects the total migration rate after $\langle n_{1M} \rangle$ has equilibrated. We define $\kappa_{\uparrow} \equiv \tau_{\uparrow}/\tau'_{\uparrow}$.

We note that $b_{\uparrow} \ll c_{\uparrow}$; thus $\kappa_{\uparrow} \approx \mu_f N / [2(\delta + \nu)]$ and the mean first arrival time (MFAT) $T_{\uparrow}$ is given by

$$c_{\uparrow} T_{\uparrow} \approx (\sqrt{\pi}/2) \Gamma(\kappa_{\uparrow}) / \Gamma(\kappa_{\uparrow} + 1/2), \quad (5)$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma function. Interestingly, only two lumped parameters remain: $c_{\uparrow}$ and $\kappa_{\uparrow}$. If $\kappa_{\uparrow} \ll 1$ (i.e., $\mu_f N \ll \delta + \nu$) the process is limited by the generation of mutants whereas if $\kappa_{\uparrow} \gg 1$ (i.e., $\mu_f N \gg \delta + \nu$) it is migration limited. By expanding Eq. 5 and using Stirling's approximation we obtain in these limits:

$$T_{\uparrow} \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2c_{\uparrow} \kappa_{\uparrow}} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\delta/\nu+1}}{\mu_f N} & (\text{if } \mu_f N \ll \delta + \nu), \\ \frac{\sqrt{\pi+\kappa_{\uparrow}}}{2c_{\uparrow}} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi/2\nu}}{\mu_f N} & (\text{if } \mu_f N \gg \delta + \nu). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The plot in Fig. 2(a) clearly reveals these two regimes.

We now turn to the lower path, $\rightarrow$. As we expect the number of mutants in patch 1 to be small we assume that $n_{1w} \approx N$. A Master Equation can then be written for the probability $P_{\rightarrow}(n, t)$ that at time t no mutation has yet occurred in patch 2 and $n_{2w} = n$. It is identical to Eq. 1 but with $w^-(n) \equiv (\delta + \nu)n$, $w^+(n) \equiv \nu N$, and $u(n) \equiv \mu_f n$. The probability $S_{\rightarrow}(t)$ that no mutation occurs before time t and the FAT distribution $F_{\rightarrow}(t)$ can now be obtained by a similar derivation as for the $\uparrow$ case.

Again the process has two time scales: $\tau_{\rightarrow} = 1/c_{\rightarrow}$, with $c_{\rightarrow} \equiv \delta + \nu + \mu_f$, and

$\tau'_{\text{anR}} = c_{\text{anR}} / (\mu_f N \nu)$. We define $\kappa_{\text{anR}} \equiv \tau_{\text{anR}} / \tau'_{\text{anR}}$; the MFAT of path $\rightarrow$, called $T_{\rightarrow}$, then reads

$$c_{\text{anR}} T_{\text{anR}} = (e / \kappa_{\text{anR}})^{\kappa_{\text{anR}}} \gamma(\kappa_{\text{anR}}, \kappa_{\text{anR}}), \quad (7)$$

where $\gamma(x, y)$ is the lower incomplete Gamma function. Fig. 2(b) is a plot of Eq. 7; it is again characterized by two regimes. Indeed, in the limits $\kappa_{\rightarrow} \ll 1$ and $\kappa_{\rightarrow} \gg 1$,

$$T_{\text{anR}} \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_{\text{anR}} \kappa_{\text{anR}}} \approx \frac{\delta/\nu+1}{\mu_f N} & (\mu_f N \ll (\delta + \nu)^2 / \nu), \\ \frac{\sqrt{\pi/2\kappa_{\text{anR}}}}{c_{\text{anR}}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\pi/2\nu}{\mu_f N}} & (\mu_f N \gg (\delta + \nu)^2 / \nu). \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

We are now in the position to calculate the full FAT distribution $F(t)$ taking into account both paths $\uparrow$ and $\rightarrow$. Since both paths are nearly independent the probability that neither path has completed at time t is $S(t) \equiv S_{\uparrow}(t)S_{\rightarrow}(t)$, from which $F(t)$ and the combined MFAT T follow. However, comparing Eq. 6 to Eq. 8 we recognize that $T_{\uparrow} < T_{\rightarrow}$ unless $\kappa_{\rightarrow} \gg 1$, in which case $T_{\uparrow} \approx T_{\rightarrow}$. Therefore we conclude that path $\uparrow$ is dominant and we should expect $F(t) \approx F_{\uparrow}(t)$ and $T \approx T_{\uparrow}$.

We tested these results using kinetic Monte Carlo simulations. Fig. 3(a) shows T as a function of K and μ_f , and Fig. 3(b) plots T versus ν for various δ . The curves are theoretical predictions calculated by numerical integration of $S(t)$. Fig. 3(c) shows all data of Figs 3(a)

and (b) in a single scaling plot. Since $T \approx T_{\uparrow}$, Eq. 5 predicts that all points should collapse on one curve if $c_{\uparrow}T$ is plotted against $\kappa_{\uparrow}$. This is indeed the case.

So far we assumed that the wild-type cannot reproduce at all in patch 2. One may expect that path $\rightarrow$ could become more relevant if it does, albeit at a reduced rate $r_{2w} < r$. We now derive results for this extended model. In the derivations for path $\uparrow$ the rate r_{2w} plays no role, but the results for path $\rightarrow$ do change. The dynamics of n_{2w} can be approximated by the rate equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} n_{2w}(t) = \nu N + r_{2w} (1 - n_{2w}/K) n_{2w} - (\delta + \nu) n_{2w}.$$

With initial condition $n_{2w}(0) = 0$ it is solved by

$$n_{2w}(t) = \frac{\nu N \tanh(c_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} t)}{c_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} + b_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} \tanh(c_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} t)}, \quad (9)$$

with $b_{\rightarrow} \equiv (\delta + \nu - r_{2w})/2$ and $c_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} \equiv (b_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}}^2 + \nu r_{2w} N/K)^{1/2}$. The expression for $S_{\rightarrow}(t)$ has the same form as Eq. 2, but with $a_{\rightarrow} \equiv \mu_f K/r_{2w}$, and we obtain

$$F_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}}(t) = \mu_f n_{2w}(t) S_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}}(t). \quad (10)$$

Again we find two time scales: $\tau_{\rightarrow} = 1/2c_{\rightarrow}$ and $\tau'_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} = [a_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}}(c_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} - b_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}})]^{-1}$. If

$\tau_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}}/\tau'_{\hat{a}\hat{n}\hat{r}} \ll 1$ (i.e., if $\mu_f K \ll r_{2w}$ or $c_{\rightarrow} \approx b_{\uparrow}$) the first time scale can be ignored and $T_{\rightarrow} \approx \tau_{\uparrow}$.

In Fig. 4 we test this result with simulations. Evidently, as long as $r_{2w} \ll \delta + \nu$ the MFAT is insensitive to changes in r_{2w} . Only when r_{2w} approaches $\delta + \nu$, $T_{\rightarrow}$ decreases rapidly.

Indeed, if $r_{2w} = \delta + \nu$ we obtain $T_{\uparrow} \approx T_{\rightarrow}$, which means that paths $\uparrow$ and $\rightarrow$ each contribute about equally to the MFAT T . We therefore conclude that in source-sink systems, where $r_{2w} < \delta + \nu$ (i.e., to the left of the vertical line in Fig. 4) a nonzero r_{2w} can result in at most a two-fold increase in the rate of adaptation.

For $r_{2w} > \delta + \nu$, although the FAT of a mutant in patch 2 is much reduced (see the red line to the right of the vertical line in Fig. 4), it is more difficult for the mutant to conquer patch 2 because it has to compete with the wild-type. To demonstrate this, Fig. 4 also shows the mean waiting time before $n_{2M} = 500$, obtained from simulations. Clearly, as $r_{2w} \rightarrow r$ the competition dramatically slows down the growth of the mutant population.

Finally, we extend the model to include a fitness cost s of adaptation, i.e., we consider $r_{1M} = (1 - s)r_{1w}$. This means that, in Eq. 1, $\gamma_{1M}(N) = (\delta + \nu)(1 - s)$. $S_{\uparrow}$ and $F_{\uparrow}$ are still given by Eqs 2-4, but with modified constants $a_{\uparrow} \equiv \mu_f N/[(\delta + \nu)(1 - s) - \mu_f]$, $b_{\uparrow} \equiv [\mu_b + \mu_f + s(\delta + \nu)]/2$, and

$c_{\uparrow} \equiv [b_{\uparrow}^2 + \nu(\delta + \nu)(1 - s) - \nu\mu_f]^{1/2}$. It follows that, in the parameter regime considered

($\mu_b, \mu_f \ll \delta, \nu$, and $\delta \gtrsim \nu$), s becomes important only when $s \gtrsim \sqrt{\nu/\delta}$. For example, even at

a low migration rate $\nu/\delta = 10^{-2}$ (that is, 99% of the organisms never migrate in their lifetime) the fitness cost is noticeable only if $s \gtrsim 0.1$. In population genetics this is considered a very large fitness pressure [2]. To conclude, the adaptation is not slowed down by a fitness cost conferred by the mutation unless the cost is very large. This apparently surprising result may be understood by noting that the mutant is initially very rare in the source so that a weak selection pressure is overwhelmed the demographic noise [27]. This result underscores the importance of stochasticity in the process.

To summarize, we formulated a stochastic model for adaptation in source-sink ecologies. In contrast with most traditional models of evolution, in which adaptation results from competition within a single well-stirred population, here adaptation is driven by spatial heterogeneity. To characterize the speed of adaptation, we derived analytical results for the arrival time of the first adapted mutant in the sink. The behavior of the system is found to have two qualitatively distinct regimes in which the system is either mutation-limited ($\mu_f N \ll \delta + \nu$) or migration-limited ($\mu_f N \gg \delta + \nu$). In the latter regime the mean FAT does not scale as $(\mu_f N)^{-1}$, as one might naively expect, but as $(\mu_f N)^{-1/2}$. Because real beneficial mutation rates and population sizes vary considerably (mutation rates in the range 10^{-5} – 10^{-10} per generation and population sizes 10^4 – 10^{10} are reasonable), both regimes can be relevant [12]. Furthermore the results demonstrate that the first adapted mutant found in the sink usually originates as a neutral mutation in the source which by chance migrates to the sink (the so-called “Dykhuizen–Hartl effect” [28, 29]). Mutations arising in the sink contribute only if the system is migration-limited ($\kappa_{\rightarrow} \gg 1$), or if $r_{2w} \approx \delta + \nu$ (when patch 2 can hardly be called a sink). Strikingly, these results hold even if the mutation is mildly deleterious in the source habitat.

Many variations on the current model can be envisioned. For instance, we assumed that the reproduction rate in patch 2 depended on the genotype while the death rate was assumed constant. Yet, in reality both rates could vary in space. Also, the model can be extended to include more than two patches, which would presumably allow for a stepwise adaptation to an environmental gradient. In future work such variations and extensions could be explored within the formalism presented here.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Center for Theoretical Biological Physics sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF) (Grant PHY-0822283).

References

- [1]. May, RM.; McLean, AR. Theoretical ecology: principles and applications. Oxford University Press; Oxford: 2007.
- [2]. Hartl, DL. A primer of population genetics. 3rd ed.. Sinauer Associates; Sunderland, Mass.: 2000.
- [3]. Holt RD. Theor Popul Biol. 1985; 28:181.
- [4]. Pulliam HR. Am Nat. 1988; 132:652.
- [5]. Pulliam HR, Danielson BJ. Am Nat. 1991; 137:S50.
- [6]. Watkinson AR, Sutherland WJ. J Anim Ecol. 1995; 64:126.
- [7]. Wright S. Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress on Genetics. 1932:355.
- [8]. Poelwijk FJ, et al. Nature. 2007; 445:383. [PubMed: 17251971]

- [9]. Perron GG, Gonzalez A, Buckling A. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2007; 274:2351. [PubMed: 17650474]
- [10]. Baquero F, Negri MC. *Bioessays.* 1997; 19:731. [PubMed: 9264256]
- [11]. Caprio MA, Tabashnik BE. *J Econ Entomol.* 1992; 85:611.
- [12]. Karasov T, Messer PW, Petrov DA. *PLoS Genet.* 2010:6.
- [13]. Sokurenko EV, et al. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2006; 4:548. [PubMed: 16778839]
- [14]. Chattopadhyay S, et al. *J Mol Evol.* 2007; 64:204. [PubMed: 17177088]
- [15]. Dennehy JJ, et al. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci.* 2010
- [16]. Holt R, Gaines M. *Evol Ecol.* 1992; 6:433.
- [17]. Kawecki TJ. *Evolutionary Ecology.* 1995; 9:38.
- [18]. Holt, RD.; Gomulkiewicz, R. *Case studies in mathematical modeling: ecology, physiology, and cell biology.* Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1997. p. 25-50.
- [19]. Holt R, Gomulkiewicz R. *Am Nat.* 1997; 149:563.
- [20]. Gomulkiewicz R, Holt RD, Barfield M. *Theor Popul Biol.* 1999; 55:283. [PubMed: 10366553]
- [21]. Kawecki TJ. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2000; 267:1315. [PubMed: 10972126]
- [22]. Ronce O, Kirkpatrick M. *Evolution.* 2001; 55:1520. [PubMed: 11580012]
- [23]. Holt RD, Gomulkiewicz R, Barfield M. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2003; 270:215. [PubMed: 12590763]
- [24]. Holt RD, Knight TM, Barfield M. *Am Nat.* 2004; 163:253. [PubMed: 14970926]
- [25]. Goel, NS.; Dyn, N. *Stochastic models in biology.* Blackburn Press; Caldwell, N.J.: 2003.
- [26]. We ignore back-migration from patch 2; this is allowed if $\nu \ll \delta$ or N_2 remains small; also, we show below that the results are insensitive to perturbations of $\gamma_M(N_1)$.
- [27]. Ohta, Gillespie. *Theor Popul Biol.* 1996; 49:128. [PubMed: 8813019]
- [28]. Kimura, M. *The neutral theory of molecular evolution.* Cambridge University Press; Cambridge: 1983.
- [29]. Dykhuizen D, Hartl DL. *Genetics.* 1980; 96:801. [PubMed: 7021316]

FIG. 1.

Source-sink model. We consider 2 patches and 2 genotypes. The wild-type can reproduce only in patch 1 while the mutant can grow in both patches. (a) Organisms mutate and migrate (indicated by arrows) and die at rate δ . (b) A wild-type population in patch 1 will in time give rise to a mutant in patch 2. Arrows indicate the two competing pathways.

FIG. 2. Mean first arrival time (MFAT) vs. parameters, for (a) path $\vec{\Gamma}^+$ and (b) path $\vec{\Gamma}^-$. In each case the MFAT depends on only two lumped parameters: c_i and κ_i . In both plots clearly two regimes can be discerned as a function of κ_i .

FIG. 3.

Mean first arrival time T as a function of parameters. Unless specified, parameters are: $r = 1$, $\delta = 10^{-1}$, $\nu = 10^{-3}$, $\mu_b = 10^{-4}$, $\mu_b = 10^{-7}$, $K = 10^5$. (a) T as a function of the carrying capacity K , for various mutation rates μ_f . Data points are averages over 10^4 simulations; lines are corresponding theoretical predictions. (b) T versus migration rate ν , for various death rates δ . (c) As predicted by the theory all data points from Figs (a) and (b) collapse on a single curve after rescaling. The plot shows two regimes, for $\kappa_{r+} \ll 1$ and $\kappa_{r+} \gg 1$, corresponding to mutation- or migration-limited dynamics.

FIG. 4.

T vs. reproduction rate of wild-type in the sink, r_{2w} . As long as $r_{2w} \approx \delta + \nu$, T is insensitive to r_{2w} because path $\rightarrow$ is dominant. When $r_{2w} \approx \delta + \nu$, $T_{\rightarrow} \approx T_{\leftarrow}$ and the process speeds up about two-fold. If $r_{2w} \approx \delta + \nu$ patch 2 is no longer a sink. Also shown is the mean time before $n_{2m} = 500$. Clearly the growth of the mutant colony slows down dramatically as r_{2w} approaches r . Parameters used: $r = 1$, $\delta = 10^{-1}$, $\nu = 10^{-3}$, $K = 10^5$, $\mu_f = 10^{-7}$, $\mu_b = 10^{-4}$.