

# On the fixation probability of an advantageous allele in a population with skewed offspring distribution

Matthias Birkner\*, Florin Boenkost†,  
Iulia Dahmer‡, Cornelia Pokalyuk§

May 6, 2024

## Abstract

Consider an advantageous allele that arises in a haploid population of size  $N$  evolving in continuous time according to a skewed reproduction mechanism, which generates under neutrality genealogies lying in the domain of attraction of a Beta( $2 - \alpha, \alpha$ )-coalescent for  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ . We prove in a setting of moderate selection that the fixation probability  $\pi_N$  of the advantageous allele is asymptotically equal to  $\alpha^{1/(\alpha-1)} s_N^{1/(\alpha-1)}$ , where  $s_N$  is the selection strength of the advantageous allele. Our proof uses duality with a suitable  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection graph.

Key words: fixation probability, skewed offspring distribution, ancestral selection graph, duality, equilibrium distribution

MSC: Primary: 60J95; Secondary: 60J28, 92D15, 60J90.

## 1 Introduction

The determination of (asymptotic or approximate) formulae for the fixation probabilities of advantageous alleles is a classical problem in population genetics, see e.g. [PW08] for an overview. Seminal formulae have been established by Haldane [Hal27] and by Kimura [Kim62]. Both formulae have been shown to be valid for certain population models with selection and offspring distributions in the domain of attraction of the Wright-Fisher diffusion, hence by duality, their genealogies under neutrality converge to Kingman's coalescent, see e.g. [Kim62] and [BGCPW21b, BGCPW21a].

Here we consider a two-type (wildtype and advantageous type) population model with fixed population size  $N$  and a skewed offspring distribution at neutral reproductions, which lies in the domain of attraction of a  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher diffusion. To this we add moderate selection, i.e. genetic drift is considerably weaker than the effect of selection. In our setting the corresponding dual ancestral selection process has an asymptotically Beta( $2 - \alpha, \alpha$ )-like coalescence structure with  $1 < \alpha < 2$  and an asymptotically linear, binary branching component. We show that the fixation probability  $\pi_N$  of the advantageous allele when starting from a single copy is asymptotically equal to  $\alpha^{1/(\alpha-1)} s_N^{1/(\alpha-1)}$ , where  $s_N \sim N^{-b}$  is the selection strength of the advantageous allele with  $0 < b < \alpha - 1$ .

A similar scenario has also been investigated in [OH21]. Okada and Hallatschek derive in their paper basically the same asymptotic formula (up to a constant) based on heuristic arguments. Here we give a

---

\*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, birkner@mathematik.uni-mainz.de

†University of Vienna, florin.boenkost@univie.ac.at

‡Goethe University Frankfurt, dahmer@med.uni-frankfurt.de

§Universität zu Lübeck, cornelia.pokalyuk@uni-luebeck.de

rigorous proof of this asymptotics including the prefactor. Our proof is based on a duality argument, a method that has been proven to be useful for this type of question, see e.g. [KN97], [Man09], [BGCPW21b].

The investigation of the interplay between selection and skewed offspring distributions is biologically highly relevant as well as mathematically intriguing. Skewed offspring distributions are believed to be common especially among marine populations and to play “a major role in shaping marine biodiversity” [HP11], p. 971. Furthermore, also for rapidly adapting populations as well as for populations subject to seasonal reproduction cycles it has been argued that multiple merger coalescents provide a reasonable null-model for the genealogy of the population, see e.g. [NH13] and [CGCSWB22]. Empirical evidence for the relevance of multiple merger coalescents has been found in genomic data from various species, e.g. *Atlantic cod* [ÁKHE23], *Japanese sardine* [NNY16], *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* [MGF20] and *Influenza* [SL12].

Neutral population models with such genealogies have been intensively studied, see e.g. [BBC<sup>+</sup>05], [HM13], [HM22], [Sch03], [KW21, Fre21, BB21]. Models that investigate the joint effect of selection and skewed offspring distributions have been analysed by various authors. One of the first models in this context was proposed and investigated, in particular with respect to duality, by Etheridge, Griffiths and Taylor in [EGT10]. Foucard [Fou13], Griffiths [Gri14] as well as Bah and Pardoux [BP15] consider  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher models and  $\Lambda$ -lookdown models, respectively. They derive criteria for which fixation of the wildtype allele and of the advantageous allele, respectively, is possible. In [CHV21] Cordero, Hummel and Véchambre study a class of  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher processes with frequency-dependent and environmental selection. They show that in this class of models fixation of one type is not always sure, but coexistence of both types is possible.

In [GCKP24] a general population model is analysed, in which individuals can reproduce neutrally and selectively according to skewed offspring distributions. In particular, the authors derive a semi-explicit formula for the fixation probability of a beneficial allele. Birkner, Dahmer and Eldon consider in [BDE24] a related population model with selection and skewed offspring distribution evolving in discrete generations. It is a weighted version of the reproduction model in [Sch03], which involves free production of juveniles followed by population size regulation via (weighted) sampling without replacement from the juvenile pool. They arrive at the same asymptotic formula for the fixation probability as we do (with a constant specific to their model). See also Section 1.4 below for more discussion.

## 1.1 Population model and main result

We consider a population of fixed size  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , where each individual is either of wildtype or of the advantageous type. The population is evolving in continuous time according to  $\Lambda$ -type neutral reproduction events as well as binary selective events. The selective and neutral events are governed by Poisson point processes  $P_N$  and  $P_S$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite measure on  $(0,1)$  and  $c_N > 0$ . We start with the neutral component of the model. We label the  $N$  individuals by  $1, \dots, N$  and let  $P_N$  be a Poisson point process with intensity  $c_N dt \otimes p^{-2} \Lambda(dp)$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0,1]$ . For every point  $(t,p)$  in  $P_N$  each individual  $i$  at time  $t$  performs an independent coin toss with success probability  $p$ . All individuals with a successful coin toss participate in the reproduction event. Among the participating individuals a single individual is chosen uniformly at random to reproduce and replace with its offspring all other participating individuals. Note that this includes the possibility that only one or no individual participates in a reproduction event, resulting in ‘silent’ events which have no effect on the frequency nor on the genealogy. Non-silent events occur at a finite rate, see (5) below, so the dynamics is well defined. We will refer to the events associated to  $P_N$  as *neutral events*. Note that the neutral component of the model alone (obtained by setting  $s_N = 0$  below) is a variation of the ‘general Moran model’ considered in [BB09, Sect. 1.2.3] and is also a time-continuous version of a special case of the class of models considered in [HM13], see also the discussion in Subsection 1.2.1 below.

In order to add selection we define  $P_S$  to be a Poisson point process on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  with intensity  $N s_N dt$ . For each point in  $P_S$ , we sample uniformly at random an individual  $i$ . Whenever  $i$  is of the wildtype nothing happens, whenever  $i$  is of the advantageous type,  $i$  reproduces in the sense that an uniformly chosen individual  $j$  is replaced by a child of individual  $i$ , in particular it receives the (advantageous) type of  $i$ . Similarly, we will refer to the events induced by  $P_S$  as *selective events*.




Figure 1: Selective arrows are depicted as dashed arrows. Individual 3 is of the advantageous type, shown in blue. Hence, individual 3 is not replaced at time  $t_0$  since individual 5 is of wildtype. At time  $t_1$  the advantageous descendant (individual 4) of individual 3 is able to use the selective arrow.

In the following we will consider  $1 < \alpha < 2$  and measures  $\Lambda$  of the form

$$\Lambda(dp) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(p) dp, \quad (1)$$

i.e.  $\Lambda = \text{Beta}(2-\alpha, \alpha)$  and

$$c_N \sim (\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha)N^{1-\alpha}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2)$$

where  $f_N \sim g_N$  is the shorthand notation for  $f_N/g_N \rightarrow 1$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The precise choice of scaling for  $c_N$  is explained in Subsection 1.2.1. Briefly speaking,  $c_N$  is chosen such that each individual dies asymptotically at rate 1. The choice (1) for  $\Lambda$  is prototypical in the context of offspring laws with infinite variance (see also (9) in Section 1.2.1) and makes explicit calculations easier, we refer to Section 1.6 for background and generalisations.

From now on we consider a regime of *moderate selection*, i.e. we assume

$$s_N \sim N^{-b}, \quad (3)$$

for some  $0 < b < \alpha - 1$ , see Subsection 1.2.2 below for interpretation.

Let  $(X_t^{(N)})_{t \geq 0}$  denote the number of wildtype individuals in the just defined model at time  $t$  and set

$$\pi_N := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N-1}(X_t^{(N)} = 0)$$

the probability of fixation of a single advantageous mutant (here,  $\mathbb{P}_{N-1}$  refers to starting from  $X_0^{(N)} = N-1$ ). We are now ready to state our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume  $0 < b < \alpha - 1$  and let  $\Lambda(dx)$  be a Beta distribution with parameters  $(2-\alpha, \alpha)$  for some  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ . Then it holds that*

$$\pi_N \sim \alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{\frac{-b}{\alpha-1}} = (\alpha s_N)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4)$$

We give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 1.5 and rigorously prove it in Section 2. Furthermore, we discuss how our result connects to the fixation probabilities in the boundary cases  $\alpha = 2$  and  $\alpha = 1$  in Section 1.6.

**Remark 1.1.** • One could easily modify the selective strength in (3) by a constant  $c_{\text{sel}}$ , i.e. use  $s_N \sim c_{\text{sel}} N^{-b}$ , and obtain the same asymptotic behaviour for  $\pi_N$  in (4) with  $(\alpha c_{\text{sel}})^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}$  as the new constant.

- Note that smaller  $\alpha$  reduces the probability of fixation. This is very plausible, since for smaller  $\alpha$  neutral fluctuations in the frequency path are stronger.

## 1.2 Choices of parameter scales

### 1.2.1 Time scale and the size of neutral events

Consider a Poisson point process  $\tilde{P}_N$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, 1]$  with intensity measure  $dt \otimes p^{-2} \Lambda(dp)$  (which coincides with  $P_N$  up to a re-scaling of time), and use the points in  $\tilde{P}_N$  to generate neutral reproduction events as above. Then, for a fixed individual among the  $N$  many, the rate at which it participates in some non-trivial event (i.e., its own  $p$ -coin toss is successful and there is at least one other individual whose  $p$ -coin toss is successful) is given by

$$\tilde{c}_N = \int_{(0,1]} p(1 - (1-p)^{N-1}) \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \sim \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha)} N^{\alpha-1}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5)$$

Hence, the prefactor  $c_N$  ( $\sim 1/\tilde{c}_N$ , which is of order  $N^{1-\alpha}$ ) in the intensity measure of the Poisson point process  $P_N$  ensures that any given individual dies due to a ‘neutral event’ with (an approximately) constant rate, irrespective of the population size  $N \gg 1$ .

Furthermore, given that the focal individual participates in the next neutral event, the conditional probability that the focal individual becomes therein the parent of  $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, N\}$  offspring is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_k^{(N)} &:= \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_N} \frac{1}{k} \binom{N-1}{k-1} \int_{(0,1]} p p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_N} \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(N-k+\alpha)}{\Gamma(N-k+1)} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)} \rightarrow \frac{\alpha-1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)} =: \tilde{p}_k, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and the conditional probability that the focal individual is not chosen as the parent and hence leaves 0 offspring is given by

$$\tilde{p}_0^{(N)} := \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_N} \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k-1}{k} \binom{N-1}{k-1} \int_{(0,1]} p p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha} =: \tilde{p}_0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7)$$

We refer to Section A.1 for proofs of these formulas.

Thus, the population model we consider here has the following equivalent description (in law): For  $k = 2, 3, \dots, N$ , each individual dies and is replaced by  $k$  children with rate  $c_N \tilde{c}_N \tilde{p}_k^{(N)}$  ( $\sim \tilde{p}_k$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ); in order to make room for these children,  $k-1$  other individuals are drawn uniformly without replacement and die as well. In addition, each individual of the advantageous type produces a single child at rate  $s_N$  which replaces one uniformly chosen individual (possibly the parent itself).

We remark that the probability law with weights  $(\tilde{p}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  (with  $\tilde{p}_1 := 0$ ) given in (6)–(7) has generating function

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \frac{1}{\alpha} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha-1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)} z^k = \frac{1}{\alpha} (1-z)^\alpha + z, \quad (8)$$

where we used

$$(1-z)^\alpha = 1 - \alpha z + \frac{\alpha(\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)} z^k.$$

In particular its mean is  $\tilde{f}'(1) = 1$ ; we see e.g. from the explicit formula in (6) that

$$p_k \sim ((\alpha - 1)/\Gamma(2 - \alpha))k^{-1-\alpha}, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (9)$$

so that it lies in the domain of attraction of a one-sided stable law with index  $\alpha$ , in particular, the variance is infinite. Let us mention that the appearance of the law (8), or a close relative like a version conditioned to be positive, is not at all surprising in the context of Beta( $2 - \alpha, \alpha$ )-coalescents, see e.g. [Ker12, GY07].

### 1.2.2 Selection of moderate strength

We regard the selection strength (3) as moderate, because for these values of  $b$  we have  $c_N \ll s_N \ll 1$ . If  $b = 0$ , selection is independent of  $N$ . This regime is generally called a regime of strong selection. When  $c_N \in \Theta(s_N)$ , i.e.  $s_N \in O(c_N)$  and  $c_N \in O(s_N)$  both hold, selection and coalescence act on the same time scale. In the context of a Wright-Fisher diffusion, i.e. in the case  $c_N = \frac{1}{N}$  and  $s_N = \frac{\gamma}{N}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , one then usually speaks of weak selection. As the selection strength we are considering lies in between these two regimes, it is reasonable to speak of moderate selection.

The case of skewed offspring distributions with weak selection, where in the scaling limit a  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher process arises, has been studied by various authors, see e.g. [Gri14, Fou13, BP15].

## 1.3 Duality

A key ingredient of the proof of the main result is the definition of an ancestral selection process  $(A_\tau^{(N)})_{\tau \geq 0}$  that is dual to  $(X_t^{(N)})_{t \geq 0}$ . We express the fixation probability in terms of the expectation of the stationary distribution of this ancestral process. Hence, an analysis of this expectation yields the proof of Theorem 1.

The  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection process  $(A_\tau^{(N)})_{\tau \geq 0}$  counts the number of potential ancestors at (backward) time  $\tau$  of a sample taken at time 0. It has the same transition rates as a suitably time rescaled block counting process of a  $\Lambda$ -coalescent with an additional branching mechanism.

**Definition 1.2** ( $\Lambda$ -ASP). *We define  $A^{(N)} := (A_\tau^{(N)})_{\tau \geq 0}$  with  $A_0 = n \in [N]$  to be the Markov process with state space  $[N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$  and transition rates  $r_{n,m}$  from  $n$  to  $m$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} r_{n,n+1} &= n s_N \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right), & n &\in \{1, \dots, N-1\} \\ r_{n,j} &= c_N q(n, j), & j &\in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \end{aligned}$$

with  $c_N \sim (\alpha - 1)\Gamma(\alpha)N^{1-\alpha}$  and

$$q(n, j) = \binom{n}{n-j+1} \int_0^1 x^{n-j-1} (1-x)^{j-1} \Lambda(dx). \quad (11)$$

The  $\Lambda$ -ASP is the block counting process corresponding to the  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection graph that one obtains informally by reversing time in Figure 1. Let us mention here the related works [CV23, GCKP24], where analogously defined  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection graphs in different settings are considered.

Note that the jump rates  $r_{n,j}$  from  $n$  to  $j$  of the  $\Lambda$ -ASP are given by the respective time changed (through multiplication with  $c_N$ ) rates of the block counting process of the  $\Lambda$ -coalescent (i.e. the rate at which some  $(n-j+1)$ -merger occurs when there are presently  $n$  blocks). The practical interest in defining the  $\Lambda$ -ASP lies in the following sampling duality. It has been used widely in the literature, in particular also to determine (asymptotic) expressions for the fixation probability. Basically it states that all individuals in a sample have the wildtype iff all potential ancestors of these individuals have the wildtype.

**Proposition 1.3** (Duality). *Let  $k, n \leq N$  and  $t > 0$ . The following hypergeometric duality holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{X_t^{(N)} (X_t^{(N)} - 1) \cdots (X_t^{(N)} - (n-1))}{N(N-1) \cdots (N-(n-1))} \middle| X_0^{(N)} = k \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k - (A_t^N - 1))}{N(N-1) \cdots (N - (A_t^N - 1))} \middle| A_0^N = n \right], \quad (12)$$

where the transition rates of  $A^{(N)}$  are given by (10).

The most relevant case of Proposition 1.3 for our analysis is the case  $k = N - 1$ , i.e. at time 0 in the population a single individual has the advantageous type. A simple consequence of Proposition 1.3 is the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Denote by  $A_{eq}^{(N)}$  a random variable whose distribution is given as the stationary distribution of  $A^{(N)}$ . Then the following holds*

$$\pi_N = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ A_{eq}^{(N)} \right]}{N}. \quad (13)$$

*Proof.* Apply Proposition 1.3 with  $k = N - 1$ ,  $n = N$  (noting that then  $X_t^{(N)}(X_t^{(N)} - 1) \cdots (X_t^{(N)} - (n - 1)) = N!$  if  $X_t^{(N)} = N$  and 0 otherwise) and make use of the fact that  $A_t^{(N)} \rightarrow A_{eq}^{(N)}$  in distribution as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  together with the dominated convergence theorem, then (13) follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.3.* Due to the construction of the  $\Lambda$ -ASG (see Def. 1.2 and the discussion below) in order to sample only wildtype individuals at time  $t$  all ancestors have to be wildtype individuals. By exchangeability it is only important to keep track of the number of potential ancestors. Hence, in order to prove (12) it suffices to show that the rates given in the definition match to the rates at which we gain or lose potential ancestors. Assume that the  $\Lambda$ -ASP consists currently of  $n$  lines. Whenever there is a selective reproduction event (which occurs at rate  $s_N N$ ), with probability  $n/N(1 - n/N)$  an individual from outside the current  $n$  lines is chosen to reproduce with offspring among the  $n$  lines, hence we have to follow an additional line and thus the  $\Lambda$ -ASP branches. This gives the rate  $r_{n,n+1}$ .

Whenever there is a neutral reproduction event with intensity  $p$  at rate  $c_N$  all  $n$  lines toss a coin, with  $n - j + 1$  participating with probability  $\binom{n}{n-j+1} p^{n-j+1} (1 - p)^{j-1}$ . All the participating lines will merge resulting in a single line for the  $\Lambda$ -ASP. Hence we lose  $n - j + 1$  lines but another one is gained and we need to follow  $j$  lines after the event. This gives  $r_{n,j}$  for all  $j \in 1, \dots, n - 1$ .  $\square$

## 1.4 Some related models

**The  $\Lambda$ -asymmetric Moran model from [GCKP24]** As already mentioned in the introduction, in [GCKP24] a related class of models involving multiple merger genealogies and two selectively distinguished types is studied. As in our paper, the corresponding dual  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection process plays an important role in [GCKP24]. There are however important differences. In the notation of [GCKP24], there are  $N$  individuals which can be of type  $\oplus$  (the fitter type) or of type  $\ominus$  (the less fit type). Reproduction is parametrised by two (probability) measures  $\Lambda^\oplus$  and  $\Lambda^\ominus$  on  $[0, 1]$ , where  $\Lambda^\oplus$  stochastically dominates  $\Lambda^\ominus$ . At rate 1, an individual is chosen uniformly at random (irrespective of its type) to reproduce; if the reproducing individual is of type  $\oplus$ , a value  $y$  is drawn from  $\Lambda^\oplus$ . Every individual then independently dies instantaneously with probability  $y$  and is immediately replaced by an offspring of the reproducing individual (with type  $\oplus$ ). The procedure is analogous if the reproducing individual is of type  $\ominus$  except that  $y$  is drawn from  $\Lambda^\ominus$ . Thus, the difference in offspring laws between the two types can (and generically will be) much greater in this model than in our set-up, and the model from [GCKP24] gives greater freedom to model this differences (a measure on  $[0, 1]$  rather than a single rate as in our case). Arguably, both selective and neutral reproduction in [GCKP24] are ‘event-based’ rather than ‘individual-based’: as it stands in [GCKP24, Sect. 1–5], the individual offspring law in the model from [GCKP24] depends on the type and on the population size  $N$ , the individual litter size will always be a (random) non-trivial fraction of the total population size  $N$ . By contrast, our setup is chosen in such a way that the individual offspring laws stabilise to a proper probability law on  $\mathbb{N}$ , see (6)–(7) and the discussion around it. In particular, our model is not a special case of the model from [GCKP24].

Furthermore, the  $\Lambda$ -ASP in [GCKP24] differs from our process in two aspects. The rate of downward jumps in [GCKP24] depends on whether the potential parent is among the potential ancestors or not. Due to our construction of the model we do not need to distinguish these cases, which simplifies the transition rates in our case. Furthermore, for our  $\Lambda$ -ASP the branching rate is asymptotically linear in  $n$  (if  $n \in o(N)$ , which is at least under stationarity with high probability the case). This is in the setting considered in [GCKP24]

in general not the case. The question analogous to our Theorem 1, namely the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  asymptotics of the fixation probability of a single advantageous mutant in a population of size  $N$  is not in the focus of [GCKP24]. ([GCKP24] do consider in Sections 6–7 an SDE version obtainable as a rescaling of their discrete population models and derive in Proposition 7.2 a series representation for the fixation probability starting from a fraction  $x \in (0, 1)$  of fit individuals in the limiting SDE model. It is tempting to insert  $x = 1/N$  there, yet is at least a priori not clear in how far this reflects the behaviour of the pre-limiting models starting from a single fit individual.)

Given the fact that [GCKP24] as well as the present paper use population models which are in sampling duality with certain branching-coalescing processes, it is conceivable that the techniques of the present paper could be applied to derive an analogue of Theorem 1 for the model from [GCKP24]. In fact, the basic proof structure we use for Theorem 1 carries over verbatim and the analogue of (13) from Corollary 1.4 holds for the model from [GCKP24]. Due to the more complicated structure of the transition rates of the ancestral process in [GCKP24] and the (much) greater generality in the choice of  $\Lambda^\oplus$  and  $\Lambda^\ominus$  compared to our set-up, a detailed analysis of the asymptotics of the fixation probabilities  $\pi_N$  in the setting of [GCKP24] seems challenging and must presently be left for possible future work.

A preliminary observation can already be made at this point: Write  $\mu^\oplus = \int_{(0,1]} y \Lambda^\oplus(dy)$  and  $\mu^\ominus = \int_{(0,1]} y \Lambda^\ominus(dy)$  for the means of  $\Lambda^\oplus$  and  $\Lambda^\ominus$ , respectively. Inspection of the jump rates of the ancestral process in [GCKP24, Prop. 4.5] (cf also the displayed equation below Proposition 4.5 there) shows that the expected loss rate of potential ancestors when there are currently  $n$  of them is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{N} \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k \binom{n-1}{k} y^k (1-y)^{n-1-k} \Lambda^\ominus(dy) + \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k \binom{n}{k+1} y^{k+1} (1-y)^{n-(k+1)} \Lambda^\ominus(dy) \\ &= \frac{n}{N} \int_{[0,1]} (n-1)y \Lambda^\ominus(dy) + \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{j=2}^n (j-1) \binom{n}{j} y^j (1-y)^{n-j} \Lambda^\ominus(dy) \\ &= \frac{n}{N} (n-1)\mu^\ominus + \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) (n\mu^\ominus - 1) + \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) \int_{[0,1]} (1-y)^n \Lambda^\ominus(dy) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) n\mu^\ominus + \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) \left( \int_{[0,1]} (1-y)^n \Lambda^\ominus(dy) - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

while the expected gain rate is always bounded by the total mass of  $\Lambda^\ominus$  (which is  $O(1)$  in [GCKP24, Sect. 1–5]). Using the heuristic idea that the equilibrium point  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}]$  should be close to that value of  $n$  where the total loss rate balances the total gain rate exactly (cf the argument at the beginning of Section 1.5) thus suggests that  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}] \approx O(1)$  and hence  $\pi_N = O(1/N)$  in the setting from [GCKP24, Sect. 1–5]. In fact, writing  $\tilde{L}^{(N)}$  for the generator of the ancestral process from [GCKP24, Prop. 4.5] and using the function  $g(x) = cx$  with a suitably chosen constant  $c \in (0, \infty)$ , quite analogous to the argument in Lemma 2.6 below, one finds

$$\max_{x \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}} \tilde{L}^{(N)} g(x) + x \leq C,$$

for some constant  $C = C(\Lambda^\oplus, \Lambda^\ominus) < \infty$ . Thus indeed  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}] \leq C$  and  $\pi_N \leq C/N$  by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1. On the other hand,  $\pi_N \geq 1/N$  is automatic and thus  $\pi_N = \Theta(1/N)$  in this model whenever  $\Lambda^\ominus \neq 0$ .

This appears also intuitively plausible: starting with one fit individual, this has a chance of  $1/N$  to be chosen as the parent in each reproduction event. If it is chosen, its offspring will afterwards constitute a non-trivial fraction of the population and since from then on the selective advantage can play out its full strength, it will be likely that the fit type prevails henceforth. However, if it not chosen as a parent, it has a non-trivial chance to die and be replaced by an offspring of an unfit individual. Thus, the chance that the initial fit individual becomes a parent before dying is  $O(1/N)$ .

**A two-type version Schweinsberg's model [Sch03] with selection** In [BDE24], the authors prove the asymptotics of the fixation probability in a moderate selection regime in a related model which uses discrete generations and weighted resampling from a pool of juveniles, extending [Sch03] who studied the neutral case. The treatment in [BDE24] follows the classical “forwards in time” route: a branching process approximation in the early stage of establishment (and in the final stage) together with quantitative control on the deviation from a deterministic approximation of the frequency path in the intermediate stage. Indeed, consider the fate of an individual of the advantageous type in our model at a time when that type is rare: Heuristically, there should then be almost no interaction among the advantageous individuals, which suggests to make the limiting law with generating function (8) slightly supercritical by allowing additional duplications at rate  $\tilde{c}_N s_N$  in addition to neutral births/deaths at constant rate, i.e. consider

$$\tilde{f}_N(z) = s_N(1 + s_N)^{-1}z^2 + (1 + s_N)^{-1}\tilde{f}(z). \quad (14)$$

In fact, one can check that then the survival probability  $1 - \tilde{q}_N = 1 - \tilde{f}_N(q_N) > 0$  of a Galton-Watson process with reproduction law (14) satisfies the asymptotics  $1 - \tilde{q}_N \sim \text{const.} \times (s_N)^{1/(\alpha-1)}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , which fits well to Theorem 1. Details of such computations can be found in [BDE24].

## 1.5 Sketch of the proof of Theorem 1

Our proof is based on the duality between the process  $X^{(N)}$  that records the number of wildtype individuals and the ancestral selection process  $A^{(N)}$ . Due to Corollary 1.4 the statement is proven once we show that  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}] \sim \alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}}$ . Heuristically, the expectation should be asymptotically equal to  $\alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}}$ , since at this point upwards and downwards drift cancel. Indeed, in Lemma 2.4 below we show that in state  $x$  the upwards drift is  $\sim x s_N$  and the downwards drift is  $\sim c_N x^\alpha \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}$ . So upwards and downwards cancel (asymptotically), if  $x N^{-b} = c_N x^\alpha \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}$ . This is the case for  $x = (\alpha N^{\alpha-1-b})^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}$ .

To control the expectation of  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}]$  rigorously we use a Lyapunov-type argument, see [GZ08] for a justification of this argument in more general settings (with infinite state spaces). Denote the rate matrix of  $A^{(N)}$  by  $Q^{(N)}$  and assume the entries of  $\pi^{(N)} := (\pi_1^{(N)}, \dots, \pi_N^{(N)})$  are the probability weights of the stationary distribution of  $A^{(N)}$  in  $1, \dots, N$ . By definition we have  $\pi^{(N)} Q^{(N)} = 0$  and since the state space of  $A^{(N)}$  is finite we also have for any vector  $g^{(N)} = (g_1^{(N)}, \dots, g_N^{(N)})^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$  that  $\pi^{(N)} Q^{(N)} g^{(N)} = 0$ . Consequently, if we find a constant  $c^{(N)}$  and a vector  $g^{(N)}$ , such that

$$Q^{(N)} g^{(N)} + (1, \dots, N)^T \leq c^{(N)} \cdot (1, \dots, 1)^T, \quad (15)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}] = \pi^{(N)} \cdot (1, \dots, N)^T \leq c^{(N)}.$$

The key step in the proof of Theorem 1 is to find a vector  $g^{(N)}$  (which also can be interpreted as a function  $g^{(N)} : \{1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) and a constant  $c^{(N)} \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}} (1 + o(1))$ , such that (15) is fulfilled. We will see that for the upper bound it suffices to consider linear functions, i.e. functions of the form  $g^{(N)}(x) = ax$  with  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , and determine an appropriate  $a = a_N$ . This also corresponds to the heuristic calculation that  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}]$  is (close to) the point where the upwards and the downwards parts of the drift balance.

One argues analogously for a lower bound on  $\mathbb{E}[A_{eq}^{(N)}]$ . In this case linear functions are not sufficient, we consider instead functions of the form  $g^{(N)}(x) = a_1 x^{\beta_1} + a_2 x^{\beta_2}$  with  $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha - 1$  and constants  $a_1 = a_1(N)$  and  $a_2 = a_2(N)$ .



## 1.6 Extensions

### Fixation probabilities in the boundary cases $\alpha = 2$ and $\alpha = 1$

In Theorem 1 we consider the case  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ . The boundary case  $\alpha = 2$  corresponds to the parameter regime in which the neutral genealogies lie in the domain of attraction of the Kingman coalescent, and in the boundary case  $\alpha = 1$  the corresponding neutral genealogies are in the domain of attraction of the Bolthausen-Sznitman coalescent.

- For the case  $\alpha = 2$ , note that  $\text{Beta}(2 - \alpha, \alpha) \rightarrow \delta_0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 2$ . For  $\Lambda = \delta_0$  there are only binary neutral events and hence our model corresponds to the classical Moran model with selection. It has been shown recently in a more general setting within the domain of attraction of Kingman's coalescent that the fixation probability of a moderately advantageous allele is asymptotically equal to  $\frac{2s_N}{\sigma^2}$ , where  $\sigma^2$  denotes the individual offspring variance, see [BGCPW21b] and [BGCPW21a]. This formula goes back to the well-known approximations given by Haldane [Hal27] and by Kolmogorov [Kol38]. Letting  $\alpha \rightarrow 2$  in Theorem 1 yields  $\pi_N \sim 2s_N$ , that is we get back Haldane's asymptotic.

In the case of a Moran model in the attraction of Kingman's coalescent ( $\Lambda = \delta_0$ ), the stationary distribution of  $A_{eq}^{(N)}$  is known to be a binomial random variable with parameters  $N$  and  $\frac{2s_N}{2s_N+1}$  conditioned to be larger than 0 as for example observed in [BGCPW21b] or [Cor17]. Applying (13) then yields Haldane's asymptotic.

- The case  $\alpha = 1$ , i.e. in the domain of attraction of a Bolthausen-Sznitman coalescent, has been considered in [Hal18]. In this regime the pair coalescence probability  $c_N$  fulfils  $c_N \sim \frac{1}{\log(N)}$  and hence for a regime of moderate selection we suggest to consider

$$s_N = \frac{1}{(\log N)^b},$$

with  $0 < b < 1$ , see Subsection 1.2.2. An ancestral selection graph which is analogous to the one from Definition 1.2 for the case  $\alpha = 1$  has transition rates  $\tilde{r}_{n,m}$  from  $n$  to  $m$  of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_{n,n+1} &= ns_N \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right), & n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\} \\ \tilde{r}_{n,j} &= c_N \frac{n}{(n-j+1)(n-j)}, & j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the upwards drift is  $\sim ns_N$  and since  $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{n-j}{(n-j+1)(n-j)} \sim \log(n)$  the downwards drift  $\sim c_N n \log(n) = \frac{n \log(n)}{\log N}$ . Upwards and downwards drift cancel if

$$n = \exp(s_N \log N).$$

This suggests that the probability of fixation of an allele with selective advantage  $s_N = \left(\frac{1}{\log(N)}\right)^b$  is asymptotically

$$\tilde{\pi}_N \sim \frac{\exp(\log(N)^{1-b})}{N} = N^{s_N-1}. \quad (16)$$

This coincides with (the heuristic) formula (16) in [Hal18] for the fixation probability of an advantageous allele when  $s = \frac{1}{\log(N)^b}$  and  $x_0 = \frac{1}{N}$ . One should be able to prove rigorously the asymptotic (16) with a similar approach as in the proof of Theorem 1.

## Other choices of $\Lambda$

In Theorem 1 we assume that  $\Lambda(dx)$  is exactly given as a Beta-distribution with parameters  $(2-\alpha, \alpha)$ , which makes the calculations in Section 2 more explicit. However, we believe that only the singularity of  $\Lambda$  at 0 is crucial for proving (4). In particular, as long as  $\Lambda(dx)$  is such that one obtains the same leading order in Lemma 2.4 and one can prove Lemma 2.5, the asymptotics for the survival probability will follow. In view of the computations in [GY07], we believe that our approach can be carried through if instead of the explicit form (1) of  $\Lambda$  we only assume that  $\Lambda([0, x]) = cx^{2-\alpha} + O(x^{3-\alpha})$  as  $x \downarrow 0$  with some constant  $c \in (0, \infty)$ . Undoubtedly, this extension will make the calculations more tedious, which is why we refrain from doing so here.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

Denote by  $L^{(N)}$  the generator of the  $\Lambda$  ancestral selection process  $A^{(N)}$  from Definition 1.2. The key ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1 is the following Proposition.

**Proposition 2.1.** *There exists  $c_1^{(N)}$  and  $c_2^{(N)} \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $c_1^{(N)}, c_2^{(N)} \sim \alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Additionally, there exist functions  $g_1^{(N)}$  and  $g_2^{(N)} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  fulfilling*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [N]} L^{(N)} g_1^{(N)}(x) + x &\leq c_1^{(N)} \\ \inf_{x \in [N]} L^{(N)} g_2^{(N)}(x) + x &\geq c_2^{(N)}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $N$  large enough.

The proof of Proposition 2.1 will be given at the end of Section 2.2. Next we give (on the basis of the statement of Proposition 2.1) a proof of Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* As pointed out in the sketch of the proof of Theorem 1 Proposition 2.1 yields (by writing the above inequalities in terms of the rate matrix  $Q^{(N)}$  of  $A^{(N)}$ , see (15)) that there exist  $c_1^{(N)}$  and  $c_2^{(N)}$  with  $c_1^{(N)}, c_2^{(N)} \sim \alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}}$ , such that

$$c_2^{(N)} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ A_{eq}^{(N)} \right] \leq c_1^{(N)}. \quad (17)$$

Then the claim of Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of (17) and Corollary 1.4.  $\square$

### 2.1 Bounds on the generator

The proof of Proposition 2.1 relies on Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, which will be proved in Section 2.2. We prepare both proofs by gathering some results regarding the generator  $L^{(N)}$  of the  $\Lambda$ -ancestral selection process.

The generator  $L^{(N)}$  of  $A^{(N)}$  acts as follows on functions  $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with  $x \in [N]$

$$L^{(N)}g(x) = xs_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) (g(x+1) - g(x)) + c_N \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y) (g(y) - g(x)). \quad (18)$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *For the transition rates  $q(x, y)$ ,  $1 \leq y < x$  given in (11) it holds*

$$q(x, y) = \frac{x}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(y+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(y)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(x-y+2)}. \quad (19)$$

The proof can be found (for completeness) in the appendix.

**Remark 2.3.** Using Gautschi's inequality, (19) implies that there exists a constant  $c = c(\alpha) \in (1, \infty)$  such that uniformly for all  $x > y \geq 1$

$$\frac{1}{c} \leq \frac{xy^{\alpha-1}(x-y)^{-\alpha-1}}{q(x, y)} \leq c.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** For functions  $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g(x) = ax$  with  $a = a(N) \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds for  $x \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$L^{(N)}g(x) = as_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) x - ac_N x \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha) - \Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}.$$

*Proof.* Recall (18). We use the following equality which follows directly from Equations (1), (5) and (8) in [GY07] ( $q(x, y)$  is  $\lambda_{x, x-y+1}$  in their notation)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y)q(x, y) &= \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y) \int_0^1 (1-u)^{y-1} \Lambda(du) \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y) \int_0^1 \frac{(1-u)^{y-1} u^{1-\alpha} (1-u)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} du \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y) \frac{\text{Beta}(2-\alpha, y-1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y) \frac{\Gamma(y-1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(y+1)\Gamma(\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Beta}(a, b)$  denotes the Beta-function, i.e.  $\text{Beta}(a, b) = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}$  for  $a, b, > 0$ .

Together with an application of Lemma A.1 this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} (x-y)q(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{x\Gamma(x+\alpha) - x\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}{\alpha(\alpha-1)\Gamma(x+1)} \\ &= \frac{x\Gamma(x+\alpha) - x\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

This together with (18) proves the lemma. □

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $0 < \beta < 1$ . We have for some constant  $c_{\alpha, \beta} \in (0, \infty)$

$$\left| \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y)(y^\beta - x^\beta) + \frac{\beta}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)} x^\beta \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha)}{\Gamma(x+1)} \right| \leq c_{\alpha, \beta} x^\beta.$$

*Proof.* For  $x > y \geq 1$ , a Taylor expansion to first order with integral remainder term yields

$$y^\beta - x^\beta = -\beta x^{\beta-1}(x-y) - \beta(1-\beta)\tilde{R}(x, y) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{R}(x, y) := \int_y^x (t-y)t^{\beta-2} dt.$$

We have

$$0 \leq \tilde{R}(x, y) \leq \int_0^x t^{\beta-1} dt = \frac{1}{\beta} x^\beta,$$

and in addition (for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ )

$$\tilde{R}(x, y) \leq \varepsilon^{\beta-2} x^{\beta-2} \frac{(x-y)^2}{2}, \quad \text{if } \varepsilon x \leq y < x.$$

Thus, using (20),

$$\sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y)(y^\beta - x^\beta) \leq -\beta x^{\beta-1} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y)(x - y) = -\frac{\beta}{(\alpha - 1)\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} x^\beta \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha - 1} x^\beta.$$

For the other bound we first estimate, using Remark 2.3 in the first inequality, and pretending  $\varepsilon x \in \mathbb{N}$  to ease readability,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y) \tilde{R}(x, y) &\leq Cx \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} y^{\alpha-1} (x - y)^{-\alpha-1} \tilde{R}(x, y) \\ &\leq Cx \sum_{y=1}^{\varepsilon x} y^{\alpha-1} (x - y)^{-\alpha-1} x^\beta + Cx \sum_{y=\varepsilon x}^{x-1} y^{\alpha-1} (x - y)^{-\alpha-1} x^{\beta-2} (x - y)^2 \\ &\leq Cx^{\beta-\alpha} \sum_{y=1}^{\varepsilon x} y^{\alpha-1} + Cx^\beta \sum_{y=\varepsilon x}^{x-1} \frac{1}{x} \left(1 - \frac{y}{x}\right)^{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{\alpha-1} \leq Cx^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y=1}^{\varepsilon x} y^{\alpha-1} &\leq \int_0^{\varepsilon x+1} t^{\alpha-1} dt \leq Cx^\alpha, \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{y=\varepsilon x}^{x-1} \frac{1}{x} \left(1 - \frac{y}{x}\right)^{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{\alpha-1} &\leq C \int_0^1 u^{\alpha-1} (1 - u)^{1-\alpha} du, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  denotes an unspecified constant (that depends on  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) whose value may change from line to line.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y)(y^\beta - x^\beta) &= -\beta x^{\beta-1} \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y)(x - y) - \beta(1 - \beta) \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} q(x, y) \tilde{R}(x, y) \\ &\geq -\frac{\beta}{(\alpha - 1)\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} x^\beta \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} - c_{\alpha, \beta} x^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

for a suitable choice of  $c_{\alpha, \beta}$  ( $\geq \beta/(\alpha - 1)$ ).  $\square$

A direct consequence of (18) and Lemma 2.5 is that for functions  $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g(x) = ax^\beta$  with  $0 < \beta < 2 - \alpha$  and  $a = a(N) \in \mathbb{R}$  there are constants  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} as_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) x((x + 1)^\beta - x^\beta) - ac_N c_\alpha \beta \cdot x^\beta \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} - c_1 x^\beta \\ \leq L^{(N)} g(x) \leq as_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) x((x + 1)^\beta - x^\beta) - ac_N c_\alpha \beta \cdot x^\beta \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} + c_2 x^\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

for all  $x \in [N]$ , where

$$c_\alpha = \frac{1}{(\alpha - 1)\Gamma(\alpha + 1)}. \tag{22}$$

## 2.2 Preparations for and proof of Proposition 2.1

According to Lemma 2.4 the generator  $L^{(N)}$  applied to linear functions  $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g(x) = ax, a > 0$  is of the form

$$L^{(N)} g(x) = as_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) x - ac_N x c_\alpha \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} + ac_N x / (\alpha - 1)$$

with  $c_\alpha$  from (22).

An application of Gautschi's inequality yields

$$x \frac{\Gamma(x + \alpha)}{\Gamma(x + 1)} > x(x + \alpha - 1)^{\alpha-1} > x^\alpha.$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$L^{(N)}g(x) \leq as_N\left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right)x - ac_Nc_\alpha x^\alpha. \quad (23)$$

We denote by  $d_N$  the solution of the equation

$$s_N\left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) - c_Nc_\alpha x^{\alpha-1} = 0. \quad (24)$$

Then

$$d_N \sim \left(\frac{s_N}{c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}, \quad (25)$$

since the left hand side of (24) is  $o(1)$  for  $x = \left(\frac{s_N}{c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}$ .

Next we show first the upper bound in Lemma 2.6 and then the lower bound in Lemma 2.7.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $g^{(N)}(x) = ax$  with  $a = a(N) = \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)s_N}$ . Then*

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in [N]} \frac{L^{(N)}g^{(N)}(x) + x}{d_N} \leq 1. \quad (26)$$

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.4 and the exposition afterwards in (23) that for  $x \in [N]$

$$L^{(N)}g^{(N)}(x) + x \leq ax(s_N - c_\alpha c_N x^{\alpha-1})(1 + R^{(N)}(x)) + x, \quad (27)$$

with  $\max_{x \in [N]} |R^{(N)}(x)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f(x) := axs_N - ac_\alpha c_N x^\alpha + x$  and rewrite (27) as

$$L^{(N)}g^{(N)}(x) + x \leq f(x) + (f(x) - x)R^{(N)}(x). \quad (28)$$

The first and second derivatives of  $f$  are

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= as_N + 1 - a\alpha c_\alpha c_N x^{\alpha-1} \\ f''(x) &= -a\alpha(\alpha-1)c_\alpha c_N x^{\alpha-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and we note that since  $a > 0$ ,  $f''(x) < 0$  for all  $x > 0$ . The function  $f$  is maximal at the point  $x_0 = \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}$  and therefore its maximal value is

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_0) &= a \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \left(s_N - c_\alpha c_N \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)\right) + \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \\ &= a \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \left(s_N - \frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha}\right) + \left(\frac{as_N+1}{a\alpha c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Since  $a = \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)s_N}$  the first term on the right hand side of (29) cancels and thus

$$f(x_0) = \left(\frac{\frac{1}{\alpha-1} + 1}{\frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)s_N} c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} = \left(\frac{s_N}{c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}.$$

Using this together with (25) and (28) shows (26).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.7.** Let  $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha - 1$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and define  $g^{(N)} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g^{(N)}(x) = a_1 x^{\beta_1} + a_2 x^{\beta_2}$  with

$$a_1 := a_1(N) := \frac{d_N}{(2^{\beta_1} - 1)s_N}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 := a_2(N) := -\frac{\beta_1 a_1 d_N^{\beta_1}}{\beta_2 d_N^{\beta_2}} = -\frac{\beta_1 d_N^{1+\beta_1-\beta_2}}{\beta_2 (2^{\beta_1} - 1)s_N}. \quad (30)$$

For this choice we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \min_{x \in [N]} \frac{L^{(N)} g^{(N)}(x) + x}{d_N} \geq 1. \quad (31)$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma 2.5 (cf. also (21)) and Gautschi's inequality, we see that for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^{(N)} g^{(N)}(x) &= a_1 s_N x \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) \left(\beta_1 x^{\beta_1-1} + R_{1,1}^{(N)}(x)\right) + a_2 s_N x \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) \left(\beta_2 x^{\beta_2-1} + R_{2,1}^{(N)}(x)\right) \\ &\quad - a_1 c_N \left(\beta_1 c_\alpha x^{\alpha+\beta_1-1} + R_{1,2}^{(N)}(x)\right) - a_2 c_N \left(\beta_2 c_\alpha x^{\alpha+\beta_2-1} + R_{2,2}^{(N)}(x)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the remainder terms satisfy for  $x = 1, 2, \dots, N$

$$|R_{1,1}^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_1 x^{\beta_1-2}, \quad |R_{2,1}^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_1 x^{\beta_2-2}, \quad |R_{1,2}^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_1 x^{\beta_1}, \quad |R_{2,2}^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_1 x^{\beta_2}$$

with some constant  $C_1 = C_1(\alpha, b, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  that does not depend on  $N$ . We can re-write (32) as

$$L^{(N)} g^{(N)}(x) = \left(s_N \left(1 - \frac{x}{N}\right) - c_\alpha c_N x^{\alpha-1}\right) (\beta_1 a_1 x^{\beta_1} + \beta_2 a_2 x^{\beta_2}) \quad (33)$$

$$+ R_1^{(N)}(x) + R_2^{(N)}(x) + R_3^{(N)}(x) + R_4^{(N)}(x). \quad (34)$$

with remainder terms satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1^{(N)}(x)| &\leq C_2 a_1 s_N x^{\beta_1-1}, \quad |R_2^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_2 a_2 s_N x^{\beta_2-1}, \\ |R_3^{(N)}(x)| &\leq C_2 a_1 c_N x^{\beta_1}, \quad |R_4^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_2 a_2 c_N x^{\beta_2} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

uniformly in  $x \in [N]$  with some constant  $C_2 = C_2(\alpha, b, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  that does not depend on  $N$ .

For ease of reference in the following calculations, let us recall here from (3), (2), (25) that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$s_N \sim N^{-b}, \quad c_N \sim (\alpha - 1)\Gamma(\alpha)N^{1-\alpha}, \quad d_N \sim \left(\frac{s_N}{c_\alpha c_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \sim \alpha^{1/(\alpha-1)} N^{1-b/(\alpha-1)}.$$

By definition of  $d_N$  (recall (24)), the first factor in the product on the right-hand side of (33) is 0 for  $x = d_N$  and by the choice of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , the second factor there is also 0 for  $x = d_N$ . Furthermore, the function  $x \mapsto s_N(1 - \frac{x}{N}) - c_\alpha c_N x^{\alpha-1}$  is strictly decreasing on  $(0, \infty)$ ; the function  $x \mapsto h(x) := \beta_1 a_1 x^{\beta_1} + \beta_2 a_2 x^{\beta_2}$  is strictly decreasing for  $x > (\beta_1/\beta_2)^{1/(\beta_2-\beta_1)} d_N$  (observe  $h'(x) = \beta_1^2 a_1 x^{\beta_1-1} + \beta_2^2 a_2 x^{\beta_2-1} = a_1(\beta_1^2 x^{\beta_1} - \beta_2^2(-a_2/a_1)x^{\beta_2})/x$ , recall  $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha - 1 < 1$  and  $a_2 = -(\beta_1/\beta_2)a_1 d_N^{-(\beta_2-\beta_1)}$ ).

Pick  $\varepsilon > 0$  so small that  $1 - \varepsilon \geq (\beta_1/\beta_2)^{1/(\beta_2-\beta_1)}$ .

**Case (i):** Consider  $x \geq (1 - \varepsilon)d_N$ . From (35) and the definitions of  $a_1, a_2$  in (30) one checks that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in [N] \cap [(1-\varepsilon)d_N, \infty)} \frac{|R_1^{(N)}(x)| + |R_2^{(N)}(x)| + |R_3^{(N)}(x)| + |R_4^{(N)}(x)|}{x} = 0,$$

by observing that for  $x \geq (1 - \varepsilon)d_N$ :

- $a_1 s_N x^{\beta_1-1} \leq C(d_N/x)x^{\beta_1} = o(x)$
- $|a_2| s_N x^{\beta_2-1} \leq C(d_N^{1-(\beta_2-\beta_1)}/x)x^{\beta_2} = o(x)$

- $a_1 c_N x^{\beta_1} \leq C d_N^{2-\alpha} x^{\beta_1} \leq C x^{2-\alpha+\beta_1} = o(x)$
- $|a_2| c_N x^{\beta_2} \leq C d_N^{2-\alpha-(\beta_2-\beta_1)} x^{\beta_2} \leq C x^{2-\alpha+\beta_1} = o(x),$

where  $C$  denotes a unspecified constant that might change from line to line. Thus we see from (33)–(34) and the discussion above that

$$\min_{x \in [N], x \geq (1-\varepsilon)d_N} \frac{L^{(N)} g^{(N)}(x) + x}{d_N} \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon, \quad (36)$$

for all large enough  $N$ .

**Case (ii):** Consider  $\varepsilon d_N \leq x < (1-\varepsilon)d_N$ . For such  $x$ , the remainders in (34), making use of (35) and recalling the definition of  $a_1, a_2$ , satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^4 |R_i^{(N)}(x)| &\leq C \left( d_N x^{\beta_1-1} + d_N^{1+\beta_1-\beta_2} x^{\beta_2-1} + d_N \frac{c_N}{s_N} x^{\beta_1} + \frac{c_N}{s_N} d_N^{1+\beta_1-\beta_2} x^{\beta_2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left( d_N x^{\beta_1-1} + d_N^{1+\beta_1-\beta_2} x^{\beta_2-1} + d_N^{2-\alpha} x^{\beta_1} + d_N^{2-\alpha+\beta_1-\beta_2} x^{\beta_2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

for some constant  $C = C(\alpha, b, \beta_1, \beta_2, \varepsilon)$  which might change from line to line, where we used the fact that  $c_N/s_N = O(d_N^{1-\alpha})$  by (25). Since  $(1-\varepsilon)d_N \geq x \geq \varepsilon d_N$  and  $\beta_1 < \alpha - 1$  we arrive at

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 |R_i^{(N)}(x)| \leq C \left( 2d_N^{\beta_1} + 2d_N^{2-\alpha+\beta_1} \right) \leq C d_N^{2-\alpha+\beta_1}.$$

For the main term, we analyse the two factors of the product in (33) separately. Writing  $[\varepsilon d_N, (1-\varepsilon)d_N] \ni x = \xi d_N$  with  $\xi \in (\varepsilon, (1-\varepsilon))$ , recalling that  $d_N$  is the solution to (24), we have for the first factor

$$\begin{aligned} s_N \left( 1 - \frac{\xi d_N}{N} \right) - c_\alpha c_N (\xi d_N)^{\alpha-1} &= s_N \left( 1 - \frac{d_N}{N} \right) - c_\alpha c_N d_N^{\alpha-1} \\ &\quad + s_N \frac{1-\xi}{N} d_N + c_\alpha c_N (d_N^{\alpha-1} - (\xi d_N)^{\alpha-1}) \\ &\geq c_\alpha (1 - \xi^{\alpha-1}) c_N d_N^{\alpha-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

On the other hand for the second term in (33) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 a_1 (\xi d_N)^{\beta_1} + \beta_2 a_2 (\xi d_N)^{\beta_2} &= \frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_1 - 1} \left( \frac{d_N}{s_N} (\xi d_N)^{\beta_1} - \frac{d_N^{1+\beta_1-\beta_2}}{s_N} (\xi d_N)^{\beta_2} \right) \\ &= \frac{d_N^{1+\beta_1}}{s_N} \frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_1 - 1} (\xi^{\beta_1} - \xi^{\beta_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Putting (37), (38) and (39) together and noting that  $\xi^{\beta_1} - \xi^{\beta_2} > 0$  (since  $0 < \xi < 1$  and  $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2$ ) we obtain with  $C(\xi) := (c_\alpha \beta_1)(2\beta_1 - 1)^{-1}(1 - \xi^{\alpha-1})(\xi^{\beta_1} - \xi^{\beta_2})$  (note  $\inf_{\varepsilon \leq \xi \leq 1-\varepsilon} C(\xi) > 0$ ) that

$$\min_{\varepsilon d_N \leq x \leq (1-\varepsilon)d_N} L^{(N)} g^{(N)}(x) \geq \left( \inf_{\varepsilon \leq \xi \leq 1-\varepsilon} C(\xi) \right) d_N^{1+\beta_1} \frac{c_N}{s_N} d_N^{\alpha-1} - C_3 d_N \geq C_4 d_N^{1+\beta_1} \quad (40)$$

with some constant  $C_4 > 0$  for  $N$  large enough due to (25).

**Case (iii):** Consider  $K \leq x < \varepsilon d_N$  for a (large) constant  $K$  that will be suitably tuned. For such  $x$ 's, when  $K$  is large enough and  $\varepsilon$  small, one checks that the term

$$a_1 s_N \beta_1 x^{\beta_1} (1 - x/N) = \frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_1 - 1} d_N x^{\beta_1} (1 - x/N) \quad (41)$$

in (32) dominates all the others (in the sense that the sum of the absolute values of all other terms is smaller than  $\delta$  times that term for sufficiently large  $N$  for some  $\delta = \delta(\beta_1, \beta_2, \varepsilon) > 0$ , which can be made arbitrarily small by choosing  $\varepsilon$  small). Indeed, since here  $x \leq d_N = o(N)$  by (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|a_2|s_N\beta_2x^{\beta_2}(1-x/N)}{a_1s_N\beta_1x^{\beta_1}(1-x/N)} &\leq \frac{\beta_2|a_2|}{\beta_1a_1}x^{\beta_2-\beta_1} = d_N^{-(\beta_2-\beta_1)}x^{\beta_2-\beta_1} \leq \varepsilon^{\beta_2-\beta_1}, \\ \frac{a_1c_Nx^{\beta_1+\alpha-1}}{a_1s_N\beta_1x^{\beta_1}(1-x/N)} &\leq C\frac{c_N}{s_N}x^{\alpha-1} = C\frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{d_N^{\alpha-1}} \leq C\varepsilon^{\alpha-1}, \\ \frac{|a_2|c_Nx^{\beta_2+\alpha-1}}{a_1s_N\beta_1x^{\beta_1}(1-x/N)} &\leq Cd_N^{\beta_1-\beta_2}\frac{c_N}{s_N}x^{\alpha-1+\beta_2-\beta_1} = C\frac{x^{\alpha-1+\beta_2-\beta_1}}{d_N^{\alpha-1+\beta_2-\beta_1}} \leq C\varepsilon^{\alpha-1+\beta_2-\beta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

with some constants  $C = C(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ . In addition note that  $|R_i^{(N)}|$  are smaller than  $1/x$  times the respective terms above by (35), hence we can ignore them.

Furthermore, the quantity in (41) is (strictly) larger than  $d_N$  as soon as  $\beta_1K^{\beta_1}(1-K/N)/(2^{\beta_1}-1) > 1$ . Thus

$$\min_{x \in [N], K \leq x < \varepsilon d_N} \frac{L^{(N)}g^{(N)}(x) + x}{d_N} \geq 1 \quad (42)$$

for all  $N$  large enough.

**Case (iv):** Consider  $x \leq K$ . Here, we work with the general formula (18) for the generator. The choice of  $a_1, a_2$  implies that there exists a function  $R_5^{(N)} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$L^{(N)}g_N(x) + x = a_1s_Nx((x+1)^{\beta_1} - x^{\beta_1})(1 + R_5^{(N)}(x)) + x, \quad x = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

and  $\max_{1 \leq x \leq K} |R_5^{(N)}(x)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . To argue that  $\max_{1 \leq x \leq K} |R_5^{(N)}(x)| \rightarrow 0$  we used that  $c_N/s_N \rightarrow 0$  and  $|a_2|/a_1 \rightarrow 0$ . In particular, due to our choice of  $a_1$  we have  $L^{(N)}g_N(1) = d_N(1 + R_5^{(N)}(1))$ . Since  $x \mapsto a_1s_Nx((x+1)^{\beta_1} - x^{\beta_1})$  is increasing for all  $x \geq 0$ , see (44) at the end of this proof, we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \min_{1 \leq x \leq K} \frac{L^{(N)}g^{(N)}(x) + x}{d_N} \geq 1. \quad (43)$$

Combining (36), (40), (42) and (43) we see that the  $\liminf$  in (31) is at least  $1 - 2\varepsilon$ , then take  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  to conclude.

Lastly, we verify that  $f(x) = x((x+1)^{\beta_1} - x^{\beta_1})$  is increasing for  $x \geq 0$ , by observing

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= (x+1)^{\beta_1} - x^{\beta_1} + x\beta_1((x+1)^{\beta_1-1} - x^{\beta_1-1}) \\ &= (x+1)^{\beta_1} \left( 1 - (1+\beta_1) \left( \frac{x}{x+1} \right)^{\beta_1} + \frac{\beta_1 x}{x+1} \right) \\ &\geq (x+1)^{\beta_1} \left( 1 - (1+\beta_1) \left( 1 - \frac{\beta_1}{x+1} \right) + \frac{\beta_1 x}{x+1} \right) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where we used a generalised Bernoulli inequality (namely,  $(1+y)^{\beta_1} \leq 1 + \beta_1 y$  for  $y > -1$  and  $0 < \beta_1 \leq 1$ ) in the last line.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* The proof is a straightforward consequence of Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7, noting that  $d_N$  defined there fulfils

$$\frac{d_N}{\alpha^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} N^{1-\frac{b}{\alpha-1}}} \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

$\square$



## A Technical results

In this section we collect (the proofs) of a couple of results, which we use in the main text. These results are presumably well known, but we recall them and their proofs for completeness and (partially) due to a lack of a point of reference.

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}
q(x, y) &= \binom{x}{x-y+1} \int_0^1 u^{x-y+1} (1-u)^{x-(x-y+1)} \frac{\Lambda(du)}{u^2} \\
&= \frac{x!}{(x-y+1)!(y-1)!} \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^1 u^{x-y-\alpha} (1-u)^{y+\alpha-2} du \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{\Gamma(x-y+2)\Gamma(y)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha+1)\Gamma(y+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x)} \\
&= \frac{x}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(y+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(y)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(x-y+2)},
\end{aligned}$$

recall  $n! = \Gamma(n+1)$  and see also e.g. [Ker12, p. 2087]. □

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $a, b > -1$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j+b)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{a-b+1} \left( \frac{\Gamma(n+a+1)}{\Gamma(n+b)} - \mathbb{1}_{b \neq 0} \frac{\Gamma(a+1)}{\Gamma(b)} \right) & \text{if } b \neq a+1, \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{a+j} & \text{if } b = a+1. \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

*In particular for  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ ,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{x-1} (x-j) \frac{\Gamma(j+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(j+1)} = \frac{x\Gamma(x+\alpha) - x\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}{\alpha(\alpha-1)\Gamma(x+1)}.$$

*Proof.* The case  $b = a+1$  follows from the functional equation of the Gamma function, in particular  $\Gamma(a+j+1) = (a+j)\Gamma(a+j)$ . In order to verify the case  $b \neq a+1$  note that then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{a-b+1} \left( \frac{\Gamma(j+1+a)}{\Gamma(j+b)} - \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j-1+b)} \right) &= \frac{1}{a-b+1} \left( \frac{(j+a)\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j+b)} - \frac{(b+j-1)\Gamma(j+a)}{(b+j-1)\Gamma(j-1+b)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{a-b+1} \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j+b)} ((a+j) - (b+j-1)) = \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j+b)},
\end{aligned}$$

for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  if  $b \neq 0$  and for  $j \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$  if  $b = 0$ . Summing this over  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  gives (45) in the case  $b \neq 0$ . In case  $b = 0$ , summing over  $j = 2, 3, \dots, n$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j)} &= \Gamma(a+1) + \sum_{j=2}^n \frac{\Gamma(j+a)}{\Gamma(j)} \\
&= \Gamma(a+1) + \frac{1}{a+1} \left( \frac{\Gamma(n+1+a)}{\Gamma(n)} - \frac{\Gamma(2+a)}{\Gamma(1)} \right) = \frac{\Gamma(n+1+a)}{(a+1)\Gamma(n)},
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of (45). Finally, note that by applying (45) two times

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{x-1} (x-j) \frac{\Gamma(j+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(j+1)} &= x \sum_{j=1}^{x-1} \frac{\Gamma(j+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(j+1)} - \sum_{j=1}^{x-1} \frac{\Gamma(j+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(j)} \\
&= \frac{x}{\alpha-1} \left( \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x)} - \Gamma(\alpha) \right) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x-1)} \\
&= \frac{x\Gamma(x+\alpha) - x\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(x+1)}{\alpha(\alpha-1)\Gamma(x+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.2.** For  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$  the following identity holds

$$\sum_{y=1}^{x-1} \frac{\Gamma(y+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(y)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(x-y+2)} = \frac{\Gamma(2-\alpha)}{\alpha} \frac{(x-1)\Gamma(x+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x+1)}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$a_y := \frac{\Gamma(y+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(y)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(x-y+2)}.$$

We show that  $\sum_{y=1}^{x+1} a_y = 0$ . This implies the claim since

$$\begin{aligned}
a_x + a_{x+1} &= \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x)} \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{\Gamma(2)} + \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha)}{\Gamma(x+1)} \frac{\Gamma(-\alpha)}{\Gamma(1)} \\
&= \frac{-\alpha x \Gamma(x+\alpha-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) + \Gamma(x+\alpha) \Gamma(1-\alpha)}{-\alpha \Gamma(x+1)} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(x+\alpha-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) (x+\alpha-1-\alpha x)}{-\alpha \Gamma(x+1)} \\
&= -\frac{\Gamma(2-\alpha)}{\alpha} \frac{(x-1)\Gamma(x+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(x+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $x^{\overline{n}} := x(x+1) \cdots (x+n-1)$  and  $x^{\underline{n}} := x(x-1) \cdots (x-n+1)$  denote the rising and respectively falling factorials. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(x-y-\alpha) &= \frac{\Gamma(x-\alpha)}{(x-1-\alpha)^{\underline{y}}} = \frac{\Gamma(x-\alpha)}{(-1)^y (\alpha+1-x)^{\overline{y}}}, \\
\Gamma(x-y+1) &= \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{x^{\underline{y}}} = \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{(-1)^y (-x)^{\overline{y}}}, \\
\Gamma(y+\alpha) &= \alpha^{\overline{y}} \Gamma(\alpha)
\end{aligned}$$

and by [AS72, 15.1.20]

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y=1}^{x+1} a_y &= \sum_{y=0}^x \frac{\Gamma(y+\alpha)}{\Gamma(y+1)} \frac{\Gamma(x-y-\alpha)}{\Gamma(x-y+1)} = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(x-\alpha)}{\Gamma(x+1)} \sum_{y=0}^x \frac{1}{y!} \frac{\alpha^{\overline{y}} (-x)^{\overline{y}}}{(-x+1+\alpha)^{\overline{y}}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(x-\alpha)}{\Gamma(x+1)} {}_2F_1(\alpha, -x, -x+1+\alpha; 1) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where  ${}_2F_1$  denotes the hypergeometric function. □

### A.1 Proof of formulas from Subsection 1.2.1

For a rough idea why  $N^{\alpha-1}$  is the correct order of magnitude of (5), which also highlights the role of the singularity of  $p^{-2}\Lambda(dp)$  at 0, we can argue as follows: For a given individual among the  $N$  many, the rate at which it participates in some non-trivial event (i.e., its own  $p$ -coin toss is successful and there is at least one other individual whose  $p$ -coin toss is successful) is given by, ignoring constants,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 p(1 - (1-p)^{N-1}) \frac{p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1}}{p^2} dp \\
&= \int_0^{1/N} p(1 - (1-p)^{N-1}) \frac{p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1}}{p^2} dp + \int_{1/N}^1 p(1 - (1-p)^{N-1}) \frac{p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1}}{p^2} dp \\
&\approx \int_0^{1/N} p(N-1) \frac{p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1}}{p^2} dp + \int_{1/N}^1 p \frac{p^{1-\alpha}(1-p)^{\alpha-1}}{p^2} dp \\
&\approx N \int_0^{1/N} p^{1-\alpha} dp + \int_{1/N}^1 p^{-\alpha} dp \approx N^{\alpha-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

**Proof of (5), (6) and (7).** We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(0,1]} p(1 - (1-p)^{N-1}) \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) = \sum_{k=2}^N \int_{(0,1]} \binom{N-1}{k-1} p^k (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \\
&= \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k}{N} \binom{N}{k} \int_{(0,1]} p^k (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) = \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k}{N} q(N, N-k+1) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{k=2}^N (k-1) q(N, N-k+1) \right) + \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{k=2}^N q(N, N-k+1) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \frac{N\Gamma(N+\alpha) - N\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(N+1)}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(N+1)} + \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{(N-1)\Gamma(N+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(N+1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha)}{\Gamma(N+1)} - \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)} + \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(N)} - \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(N+1)} \\
&\sim \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)} N^{\alpha-1}, \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where we used in (46) the identities (20) and that by Lemma 2.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=2}^N q(N, N-k+1) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{N}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(N-k+\alpha)}{\Gamma(N-k+1)} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{\Gamma(j+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(j)} \frac{\Gamma(N-j-\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(N-j+2)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{(N-1)\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(N+\alpha-1)}{\alpha\Gamma(N+1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{(N-1)\Gamma(N+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(N+1)};
\end{aligned}$$

here, the third equality is from Lemma A.2 (see also e.g. [HM13, Appendix]).

For (6) note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \binom{N-1}{k-1} \int_{(0,1]} p p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) &= \frac{1}{N} \binom{N}{k} \int_{(0,1]} p^k (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} q(N, N-k+1) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{N}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(N-k+\alpha)}{\Gamma(N-k+1)} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha)}{\Gamma(k+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (19) from Lemma 2.2 in the second line.

For (7) write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k-1}{k} \binom{N-1}{k-1} \int_{(0,1]} p p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) &= \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k-1}{N} \binom{N}{k} \int_{(0,1]} p^k (1-p)^{N-k} \frac{1}{p^2} \Lambda(dp) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=2}^N (k-1) q(N, N-k+1) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{N\Gamma(N+\alpha) - N\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(N+1)}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)\Gamma(N+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha)}{\Gamma(N+1)} - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \sim \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)} N^{\alpha-1}, \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (20) in the third equality. □

## Acknowledgement

We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their friendly and helpful comments which corrected inconsistencies and improved the presentation.

## References

- [ÁKHE23] E. Árnason, J. Koskela, K. Halldórsdóttir, and B. Eldon. Sweepstakes reproductive success via pervasive and recurrent selective sweeps. *eLife*, 12:e80781, 2023.
- [AS72] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun. Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables. 10th printing, with corrections. 1972.
- [BB09] M. Birkner and J. Blath. Measure-valued diffusions, general coalescents and population genetic inference. In *Trends in stochastic analysis. Papers dedicated to Professor Heinrich von Weizsäcker on the occasion of his 60th birthday.*, pages 329–363. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [BB21] M. Birkner and J. Blath. Genealogies and inference for populations with highly skewed offspring distribution. in *Probabilistic Structures in Evolution*, E. Baake, A. Wakolbinger, eds., EMS Press, Berlin, 2021.
- [BBC<sup>+</sup>05] M. Birkner, J. Blath, M. Capaldo, A. Etheridge, M. Möhle, J. Schweinsberg, and A. Wakolbinger. Alpha-stable branching and beta-coalescents. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 10:303–325, 2005.
- [BDE24] M. Birkner, I. Dahmer, and B. Eldon. Fixation probability under skewed offspring distributions in a moderate selection regime, 2024+. Manuscript in preparation.
- [BGCPW21a] F. Boenkost, A. González Casanova, C. Pokalyuk, and A. Wakolbinger. Haldane’s formula in Cannings models: The case of moderately strong selection. *J. Math. Biol.*, 83(70):31, 2021.

- [BGCPW21b] F. Boenkost, A. González Casanova, C. Pokalyuk, and A. Wakolbinger. Haldane’s formula in Cannings models: The case of moderately weak selection. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26(4):36, 2021.
- [BP15] B. Bah and E. Pardoux. The  $\Lambda$ -lookdown model with selection. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 125(3):1089–1126, 2015.
- [CGCSWB22] F. Cordero, A. González Casanova, J. Schweinsberg, and M. Wilke-Berenguer.  $\Lambda$ -coalescents arising in populations with dormancy. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 27(9):1–34, 2022.
- [CHV21] F. Cordero, S. Hummel, and G. Véchambre.  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher processes with general selection and opposing environmental effects: fixation and coexistence, 2021. arXiv:2112.10560.
- [Cor17] F. Cordero. Common ancestor type distribution: A Moran model and its deterministic limit. *Stoch. Processes Appl.*, 127.2, 2017.
- [CV23] F. Cordero and G. Véchambre. Moran models and Wright–Fisher diffusions with selection and mutation in a one-sided random environment. *Adv Appl Probab*, page 1–67, 2023.
- [EGT10] A. M. Etheridge, R.C. Griffiths, and J.E. Taylor. A coalescent dual process in a Moran model with genic selection, and the lambda coalescent limit. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 78(2):77–92, 2010.
- [Fou13] C. Foucart. The impact of selection in the  $\Lambda$ -Wright-Fisher model. *Electron Commun Probab*, 18:1 – 10, 2013.
- [Fre21] F. Freund. Multiple-merger genealogies – models, consequences, inference. in *Probabilistic Structures in Evolution*, E. Baake, A. Wakolbinger, eds., EMS Press, Berlin, 2021.
- [GCKP24] A. González Casanova, N. Kurt, and J.L. Pérez. The ancestral selection graph for a  $\Lambda$ -asymmetric Moran model. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 2024.
- [Gri14] R.C. Griffith. The  $\Lambda$ -Fleming-Viot process and a connection with Wright-Fisher diffusion. *Adv Appl Probab*, 46(4):1009–1035, 2014.
- [GY07] A. Gnedin and Y. Yakubovich. On the number of collisions in  $\Lambda$ -coalescents. *Electron. J. Probab.*, (12), 2007.
- [GZ08] P. W. Glynn and A. Zeevi. Bounding stationary expectations of Markov processes. *Markov processes and related topics: a Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.*, pages 195–214, 2008.
- [Hal27] J. Haldane. A mathematical theory of natural and artificial selection. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, (23):607–615, 1927.
- [Hal18] O. Hallatschek. Selection-like biases emerge in population models with recurrent jackpot events. *Genetics*, 2018.
- [HM13] T. Huillet and M. Möhle. On the extended Moran model and its relation to coalescents with multiple collisions. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 87:5–14, 2013.
- [HM22] T. Huillet and M. Möhle. Asymptotic genealogies for a class of generalized Wright–Fisher models. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.*, 9(1):17–43, 2022.
- [HP11] D. Hedgecock and A.I. Pudovkin. Sweepstakes reproductive success in highly fecund marine fish and shellfish: A review and commentary. *B Mar Sci*, 87(4):971–1002, 2011.
- [Ker12] G. Kersting. The asymptotic distribution of the length of Beta-coalescent trees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, (22):2086–2107, 2012.

- [Kim62] M. Kimura. On the probability of fixation of mutant genes in a population. *Genetics*, (47):713–719, 1962.
- [KN97] S. M. Krone and C. Neuhauser. Ancestral processes with selection. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 51:210–237, 1997.
- [Kol38] A.N. Kolmogorov. Zur Lösung einer biologischen Aufgabe. *Comm. Math. Mech. Chebyshev Univ. Tomsk*, 2(1):1–12, 1938.
- [KW21] G. Kersting and A. Wakolbinger. Probabilistic aspects of  $\Lambda$ -coalescents in equilibrium and in evolution. in *Probabilistic Structures in Evolution*, E. Baake, A. Wakolbinger, eds., EMS Press, Berlin, 2021.
- [Man09] S. Mano. Duality, ancestral and diffusion processes in models with selection. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, (75):164–175, 2009.
- [MGF20] F. Menardo, S. Gagneux, and F. Freund. Multiple Merger Genealogies in Outbreaks of Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 38(1):290–306, 2020.
- [NH13] R. Neher and O. Hallatschek. Genealogies of rapidly adapting populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 110(2):437–442, 2013.
- [NNY16] H.S. Niwa, K. Nashida, and T. Yanagimoto. Reproductive skew in Japanese sardine inferred from DNA sequences. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, 2016.
- [OH21] T. Okada and O. Hallatschek. Dynamic sampling bias and overdispersion induced by skewed offspring distributions. *Genetics*, *iyab135*, 2021.
- [PW08] Z. Patwa and L. Wahl. The fixation probability of beneficial mutations. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 28(5), 2008.
- [Sch03] J. Schweinsberg. Coalescent processes obtained from supercritical Galton-Watson processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 106:107–139, 2003.
- [SL12] N. Strelkova and M. Lässig. Clonal interference in the evolution of influenza. *Genetics*, 192(2):671–682, 2012.