Dynamics of gametic disequilibria between loci linked to chromosome inversions: the recombination-redistributing effect of inversions
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Summary
The total gametic disequilibrium between two loci linked to polymorphic inversions can be partitioned into two types of components: within and between chromosome arrangements. The within components depend on the gametic disequilibrium within each chromosome arrangement. The between components depend on the locus-inversion disequilibria. This partitioning has practical applications and is indispensable for studying the dynamics of these systems because inversions greatly reduce recombination in the heterokaryotypes while allowing free, and sometimes different, recombination in each of the homokaryotypes. We provide equations for the per generation change of the various disequilibria for systems with two and three chromosome arrangements, and the general recursive equations predicting the disequilibria after any number of generations for the case of two arrangements. Simulation studies were carried out using different values of the recombination parameters and all possible initial conditions. The results show a complex convergence to linkage equilibrium in inversion systems. The various disequilibria can have local maxima and minima while approaching equilibrium and, moreover, their dynamics cannot be described, in general, using a single parameter, i.e. an effective recombination rate. We conclude that the effects of inversions on gametic disequilibria must be carefully considered when dealing with disequilibria in inversion systems. The formulae provided in this paper can be used for such purpose.

1. Introduction
Chromosome inversions not only diminish but also redistribute recombination among the various karyotypes. In the heterokaryotypes, single crossovers within the inversion loop give rise to non-functional or non-viable aneuploid meiotic products. Recombinants between loci included within the inverted segment (or between one locus and the inversion itself) result from double crossovers and gene conversion events only. Since these processes take place at very low rates, of the order of $10^{-5}$ or $10^{-4}$ per locus per generation (Chovnick, 1973; Ishii & Charlesworth, 1977), recombination is drastically reduced, yet not completely excluded, in the heterokaryotypes. In the homokaryotypes, on the other hand, recombination is freely allowed and when inversions shift the position of genes along the chromosome, recombination rates differ among homokaryotypes for different arrangements.

Obviously, the effects on recombination exerted by chromosome inversions should be taken into account when measuring and testing gametic disequilibria between loci. The usual way to do so is to calculate the association considering only those chromosomes with a particular arrangement (Charlesworth et al. 1979; Fontdevila et al. 1983; Zapata et al. 1986; Knibb et al. 1987; Knibb & Barker, 1988; Zapata & Alvarez, 1992), i.e. the disequilibrium within chromosome arrangements. When there are locus-inversion disequilibria, associations between loci result also from the pooling of different chromosome arrangements. This disequilibrium can be termed disequilibrium between chromosome arrangements. The total disequilibrium between two loci, $A$ and $B$, linked to a polymorphic chromosome, $C$, may be partitioned into within and between components as follows (Ruiz et al. 1991):

$$D_{AB} = u_1 D_{AB(C_1)} + u_2 D_{AB(C_2)} + \frac{D_{AC} D_{BC}}{u_1 u_2},$$

(1)
where \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) are the frequencies of the two chromosome arrangements, \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \); \( D \) refers to Lewontin–Kojima (1960) measure of gametic disequilibrium; \( D_{AB,C} \) is the disequilibrium between \( A \) and \( B \) within arrangement \( C \) (producing the within components of total disequilibrium); and \( D_{AC} \) and \( D_{BC} \) are the locus-inversion disequilibria (producing the between component, \( D_{AB,C} = (D_{AC} D_{BC})/(u_1 u_2) \)).

Locus-inversion disequilibria may be accounted for by several factors. The coadaptation hypothesis postulates that inversions protect allele combinations that are favourable or adaptive from recombination (Dobzhansky, 1970; Lewontin, 1974; Krimbas & Loukas, 1980). This proposal is supported by theoretical work on the origin and increase in frequency of inversions. Multilocus models show that locus-inversion disequilibria are generated when an inversion trapping an allele combination with high fitness increases in frequency (Charlesworth & Charlesworth, 1973). In two-locus, two-allele models with selection, when the system finally reaches equilibrium, locus-inversion disequilibria are maximal if recombination in heterokaryotypes is zero (Deakin, 1972; Charlesworth, 1974; Deakin & Teague, 1974). There are, however, other non-selective explanations. Ishii & Charlesworth (1977) derived the rate of decay of locus-inversion disequilibria and pointed out that these disequilibria may be historical if the associations generated by chance when the inversion arose are kept long enough over time by the recombination-reducing effect of inversions. Additionally, random drift may also produce locus-inversion disequilibria if the effective population size is small enough (Nei & Li, 1975, 1980; Strobeck, 1983).

Gametic disequilibria within chromosome arrangements may also arise by selective and non-selective causes, although relatively little work has been done on this particular subject. Theoretical work on the origin of inversions (Deakin, 1972; Charlesworth, 1974; Deakin & Teague, 1974) predicts that in two-locus, two-allele systems gametic disequilibrium within chromosome arrangements will be non-existent when the inversion reaches equilibrium if recombination in the heterokaryotypes is zero. However, in more complex situations, epistatic selection may conceivably generate this kind of disequilibrium. The existence of within disequilibrium is implicit in the model of recombination-induced heterosis proposed by Wasserman (1968) in which several coadapted haplotypes are assumed to segregate inside each of the arrangements. A formal and explicit treatment of the rate of decay of disequilibria within chromosome arrangements has not been carried out. The rate of decay of the total disequilibrium between two loci linked to polymorphic inversions has not been worked out either.

In this paper, we first extend the partition of the total disequilibrium between two loci to the general case of multiple alleles and chromosome arrangements. Then, we derive the rate of decay of the different components in an ideal (infinite and panmictic) population for systems of two multiallelic loci linked to chromosomes polymorphic for two or three arrangements, a common type of inversion polymorphism in Drosophila (Sperlich & Pfriem, 1986; Krimbas & Powell, 1992). Finally, we explore the dynamics of gametic disequilibria in these systems by means of deterministic simulations.

2. The model

We analysed the dynamics of gametic disequilibria in a system of two multiallelic loci, \( A \) and \( B \), linked to a chromosome, \( C \), segregating for two or three arrangements. Recombination was the only evolutionary factor considered in our model. That is, we assumed the population to be infinite and panmictic, generations to be discrete, and selection, mutation and migration to be absent. The only parameters that may change in this model from one generation \( t \) to the next \( (t+1) \) are gametic frequencies and, therefore, gametic disequilibria. Allelic frequencies are constant in the population taken as a whole but may change within a particular chromosome arrangement. We used the measures of disequilibrium \( D \) (Lewontin & Kojima, 1960) and \( D' = D/D_{max} \) (Lewontin, 1964).

Two loci may be linked to an inversion in several ways. Here we consider three possibilities: both loci, only one, or none of them located within the inverted chromosome segment (Fig. 1). Four recombination parameters are required to provide a full description of the system dynamics. Let \( r_A \) (\( r_B \)) denote the recombination frequency between locus \( A \) (\( B \)) and the inversion, and \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) that between \( A \) and \( B \) in the two possible homokaryotypes, \( C_1 C_1 \) and \( C_2 C_2 \), respectively. Assuming no interference, the recombination frequency between \( A \) and \( B \) in the heterokaryotypes, \( r_{1BH} \), is equal to \( r_A + r_B - 2r_A r_B \). In the case of three chromosome arrangements which differ by two overlapping inversions, the two loci may be located in several different positions also. Here we considered six cases (cases in which the two loci are located beyond the same breakpoint of an inversion are assimilable to the cases with two arrangements). Those cases may be described using nine recombination parameters. Let \( r_A (r_B) \) be the recombination frequency between locus \( A \) (\( B \)) and inversion \( C_1 \); \( r_A (r_B) \) that with inversion \( C_2 \); \( r_1 (r_2) \) that with inversion \( C_3 \). The frequencies of recombination between \( A \) and \( B \) in the three homokaryotypes, \( C_1 C_1 \), \( C_2 C_2 \), and \( C_3 C_3 \), will be denoted as \( r_1 \), \( r_2 \), and \( r_3 \), respectively. The recombination frequencies between \( A \) and \( B \) in the three heterokaryotypes can be defined, assuming no interference, as above: \( r_{12} = r_1 + r_2 - 2r_A r_B \); \( r_{13} = r_A + r_B - 2r_A r_B \); \( r_{23} = r_A + r_B - 2r_A r_B \). All these recombination parameters include any processes, such as crossing-over and gene conversion events,
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Fig. 1. The three possible general situations (a, b and c) of loci \( A \) and \( B \) in relation to the two chromosome arrangements. Recombination parameters are indicated.

producing effective recombination between the two loci or between one of them and an inversion.

The analytical study of the model was carried out as far as possible using Mathematica 2.2 (1993). The algebra, however, quickly becomes unwieldy and we used deterministic simulations to explore the dynamical outcome of the entire set of possible initial conditions and recombination parameters. The simulations iterated the recursive equations previously derived for either 2000 generations or until the absolute value of all disequilibria became less than \( 10^{-6} \).

3. Results

(i) Partition of the gametic disequilibrium between two loci into components: generalization to multiple alleles and chromosome arrangements

Consider two loci, \( A \) and \( B \), with \( m \) and \( n \) alleles, respectively \( (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m; B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_n) \) and a polymorphic chromosome, \( C \), with an arbitrary number, \( k \), of chromosome arrangements \( (C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n, C_{n+1}, \ldots, C_k) \). Such a system allows for \( mnk \) different gametic combinations (haplotypes). A full description of the \( (mnk-1) \) independent haplotype frequencies requires the same number of parameters. The appropriate description for studying the dynamics of the system includes three types of parameters: the allelic frequencies, the locus-inversion disequilibria, and the disequilibria between the two loci within each of the chromosome arrangements. There are \( (m+n+k-3) \) independent allelic frequencies. Let \( p_j \) \( (q_j) \) denote the population frequency of the allele \( A_j \) \( (B_j) \), and \( u_i \) \( (u_j) \) that of chromosome arrangement \( C_i \) \( (C_j) \). There are \( mk \) disequilibrium parameters describing the association between locus \( A \) and chromosome \( C \) of the form:

\[ D_{AjC_i} = f(A_j, C_i) - p_j u_i, \]

yet only \((m-1)(k-1)\) are independent. Similarly, there are \((n-1)(k-1)\) independent disequilibrium parameters between locus \( B \) and chromosome \( C \). Finally, any chromosome arrangement, \( C_i \), may be considered as a separate subpopulation, and the disequilibrium between the two loci calculated within this subpopulation. There can be \((m-1)(n-1)\) independent disequilibrium parameters \( (D_{ABjC_iC_j}) \) describing the association between the two loci within each of the \( k \) chromosome arrangements.

An alternative description of the \( mnk \) haplotypes may be obtained using a different set of parameters: the allelic frequencies, the pairwise gametic disequilibria \( D_{AB}, D_{AC} \) and \( D_{BC} \), and the three-locus disequilibria \( D_{ABC} \) (see Bennet, 1954; Thompson & Baur, 1984; Robinson et al. 1991). For each allele combination, \( A_j B_k \), a disequilibrium parameter may be defined in the total population, \( D_{ABj} = f(A_j, B_k) - p_j q_k \). There will be \( mn \) such disequilibrium parameters, yet only \((m-1)(n-1)\) will be independent. This total disequilibrium may be shown to be equal to:

\[ D_{ABj} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i D_{AiBjC_i} + \sum_{i<j} D_{AiC_i} D_{BjC_j} u_i u_j, \]

where the following simplifying notation is used:

\[ D_{AiBj} = u_j D_{AjC_i} - u_i D_{AjC_j}, \]

\[ D_{AiC_i} = u_i D_{AjC_i} - u_j D_{AjC_j}. \]

Equation 3 shows that the total disequilibrium between two loci can be partitioned into \( k \) within arrangements components (as many as different arrangements, first term in the right hand of the eqn) and \( k(k-1)/2 \) between arrangements components (as many as different heterokaryotypes, second term in the right hand). This formula is a generalization of that provided by Ruiz et al. (1991) for the simple case of two chromosome arrangements. In addition, each haplotype has a three-locus disequilibrium parameter associated with it, \( D_{ABC} \) (Thompson & Baur, 1984). Thus, there are \( mnk \) such parameters, yet only \((m-1)\)
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and the disequilibrium within arrangement $C_i$, may be expressed in a similar way. Using (3), (6) and (7), the total disequilibrium $D_{AB}$ in generation $t+1$ may be derived:

$$D_{AB}(t+1) = u_1 D_{ABC1}(t)(1-u_1 r_1-u_2 r_{12})$$
$$+ u_2 D_{ABC2}(t)(1-u_2 r_2-u_1 r_{12})$$
$$+\frac{D_A(t) D_{BC}(t)}{u_1 u_2} (1-r_{12})$$

(iii) Disequilibrium dynamics with two chromosome arrangements

As pointed out before, in our model, the only parameters that can change from one generation $(t)$ to the next $(t+1)$ are the two disequilibria within, $D_{ABC}$ and $D_{ABC2}$, and the two locus-inversion disequilibria that build together the component of total disequilibrium, $D_{BTW} = (D_{AC} D_{BC})(u_1 u_2)$. Using matrix algebra and eqns 6 and 7, it can be proved that the general recursions for $D_{BTW}(t)$, $D_{ABC1}(t)$ and $D_{ABC2}(t)$ are:

$$D_{BTW}(t) = D_{BTW}(0) \lambda_1^t$$
$$D_{ABC1}(t) = k \lambda_1^t + m_1 \lambda_2^t + m_2 \lambda_3^t$$
$$D_{ABC2}(t) = j \lambda_1^t + n_1 \lambda_2^t + n_2 \lambda_3^t$$

where the $\lambda_i$ are the eigenvalues of the system (see the Appendix for notation and derivation). Obviously, the total disequilibrium between $A$ and $B$, $D_{AB}(t)$, can also be expressed in these terms:

$$D_{AB}(t) = \lambda_1^t (D_{BTW}(0)+u_1 k+u_2 j)+\lambda_2^t (u_1 m_1+u_2 n_1)$$
$$+\lambda_3^t (u_1 m_2+u_2 n_2)$$

It can be shown that $0 < \lambda_1$, $\lambda_2$, $\lambda_3 < 1$ unless $r_1 = r_2 = 0$, in which case $\lambda_1 = 1$. Therefore, it is obvious from eqn 9 that the system will always tend to an equilibrium point in which $D_{AB}(t) = D_{BTW}(t) = D_{ABC1}(t) = D_{ABC2}(t) = 0$, except when $r_1 = r_2 = 0$. In the latter case, when $t$ tends to $\infty$, $D_{ABC1}(t) = D_{ABC2}(t) = 0$ and $D_{AB}(t) = D_{BTW}(0)$, yet this will never happen as long as double crossovers and gene conversion events present $r_{12}$ from being zero. The asymptotic rate per generation of approach to equilibrium is given by min$[1-\lambda_1, 1-\lambda_2, 1-\lambda_3]$; comparing these rates with that in a system without inversions ($r_1$ or $r_2$) it is obvious that the approach to equilibrium is always delayed in a system with two chromosome arrangements, just as expected from their recombination-reducing effect.

A most interesting feature of this system is that the total disequilibrium and the within arrangements disequilibria do not converge to equilibrium in a monotonically decreasing way even through the locus-inversion disequilibria do. The generation at which the maximum or minimum value of disequilibrium is attained ($t_{max}$) can be ascertained by equating to zero

$$(n-1)(k-1)$$
These oscillations are the product of their dynamical sient, they can last many generations. For example, if proved in this way that these disequilibria can have DAC maximum values for extreme and intermediate values (for example, positive disequilibria were given all possible combinations of r1 = r2 = 0.2, rA = rB = 0.01). [D and D' are shown.]

...the first partial derivatives of eqns. 9 and 10. It can be proved in this way that these disequilibria can have local maxima and minima for t > 0, i.e. they can increase and decrease during their convergence to equilibrium. Even though these oscillations are transient, they can last many generations. For example, if r1 = r2 = 0.2, rA = rB = 0.06, u1 = 0.9, DABC1(0) = 0.25 and DABC2(0) = -0.25, then tmax for DABC is 72 and tmax for DAB is 34.

A deterministic simulation study was carried out to explore the full space of possible initial conditions and recombination parameters. In these simulations, locus-inversion disequilibria and within arrangements disequilibria were given all possible combinations of extreme and intermediate values (for example, positive maximum values for DAC and DBC; a negative maximum value for DABCD1 and a positive maximum for DABCD2) and similarly with the allelic and inversion frequencies (for example, p1 = q1 = 0.5, u1 = 0.9 and u1 = 0.1). Recombination parameters covered the three cases depicted in Fig. 1 and included also a survey of variation in the magnitude of recombination. Every set of recombination parameters was combined with every set of initial values of frequencies and disequilibria.

As analytically shown from eqns 9 and 10, the total and within arrangements disequilibria can experience oscillations during their convergence to equilibrium. These oscillations are the product of their dynamical interactions and, therefore, are useful to their study. The necessary conditions for these oscillations to take place are the following.

(1) The within disequilibria can increase in two different ways. First, when DABCDTW, rA, rB ≠ 0 (Fig. 1 c). In this case, as can be seen from eqn 7, the increase is a consequence of double crossing-over in the heterokaryotypes (Fig. 2). The disequilibria generated in this manner always have the same sign as the between component of the total disequilibrium; it is generated in the same amount in both arrangements, but may decay at a different rate in each one. Second, when there is a difference in disequilibrium between the two arrangements, double crossing-over can also produce disequilibrium within an arrangement from the disequilibrium within the other because of the transfer of non-equilibrium gametes (haplotypes) between arrangements.

(2) The basic condition for the total disequilibrium to increase is that its components have different signs and decay at different rates. This will happen when:

(2.1) In a given generation, DABCD1 and DABCD2 have different signs and different absolute values. Then DAB will increase if the rate of decay of the within component whose sign is imposed on DAB is large enough for this disequilibrium to disappear and the other disequilibrium to become dominant. This will occur more easily when the two within disequilibria decay at different rates, and this will happen when (see eqn 9) (a) recombination frequencies are different in the two homokaryotypes, or (b) the two chromosome arrangements have different frequencies (Fig. 3 a).

(2.2) The sign of the between component is different from the sign of the within components and their values and rates of decay are such that they determine alternatively the sign of DAB (Fig. 3 b).

Given that in this case the total disequilibrium includes three components, there can be at most a major local maximum and a major local minimum in the approach to the equilibrium. Of course, the production of new within disequilibria allows new oscillations, but their magnitude is negligible because...
The new within disequilibria are always small (about $10^{-4}$, see Fig. 2).

These simulations are just aimed to explore the behaviour of our model in the whole space of possible initial conditions. However, situations with special biological significance can be studied. An example is represented in Fig. 3c. If an inversion, after increasing in frequency, remains associated with the gamete in which it originated, a total disequilibrium can be generated of inverse sign to that in the original population, giving rise to the kind of dynamics we have just described.

(iv) Three chromosome arrangements. Per generation rate of decay of gametic disequilibrium and disequilibrium dynamics

We will consider now the case of three chromosome arrangements, $C_1$, $C_2$ and $C_3$. We derive the per generation rate of decay of the various disequilibria under the same conditions as above. The simulations were carried out using the same criteria as above. The associations of allele $A$ and the three chromosome arrangements in generation $t+1$ are:

$$D_{AC}(t+1) = D_{AC}(t) - r_A D_{AC}(t) - r_A' D_{AC}(t)$$

$$D_{AC3}(t+1) = D_{AC3}(t) + r_A D_{AC}(t) - r_A' D_{AC3}(t)$$

$$D_{AC1}(t+1) = D_{AC1}(t) + r_A' D_{AC}(t) + r_A'' D_{AC3}(t)$$

where the notation follows that in (4). Analogous expressions can be derived in locus $B$. We can see that the locus-inversion disequilibria do not decrease monotonically in this case. They are not independent because $D_{AC} + D_{AC3} + D_{AC1} = D_{BC3} + D_{BC1} + D_{BC1} = 0$. These disequilibria, therefore, may experience oscillations due to their different signs and rates of decay (Fig. 4).

The disequilibrium between alleles $A$ and $B$ within chromosome arrangement $C_i$ in generation $t+1$ is:

$$D_{AB,C_i}(t+1) = D_{AB,C_i}(t) - r_A D_{AB,C_i}(t) - r_A' D_{AB,C_i}(t)$$

where $D_{AB,C_i}(t)$ and $D_{AB}$ are shown. The conditions for $D_{AB}$ to increase are fully analogous to those of the system with two arrangements. The only difference is that there can be more oscillations because of the presence of three within and three between components which may
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4. Discussion

When two multiallelic loci are linked to a system of quantitative effect: the percentage of haplotype distances separating loci are long enough (Foss et al., 1995), allowing one to disentangle the source of particular allelic associations observed in natural populations. On the other side, since the disequilibrium within arrangements and the locus-inversion disequilibria decay at different rates, it is the appropriate starting point to study the dynamics of these systems.

We have used for this dynamical analysis a relatively simple model in which the only evolutionary factor involved was recombination. We focused our attention on such a model because any special feature of its dynamics may be attributed entirely to the presence of inversions that reduce and redistribute recombination. The effect of other evolutionary forces, such as selection, migration, mutation or genetic drift, is currently under investigation (Navarro et al., unpublished). One of the features of our model is no interference, which is a realistic assumption only when distances separating loci are long enough (Foss et al. 1993). However, even when interference has an effect in our system, it will not be a qualitative but a quantitative effect: the percentage of haplotype (gamete) transference between arrangements will tend to be increased when compared with the percentage of independent transference of the two loci.

The disequilibrium between two loci not linked to chromosome inversions decays according to the known expression: $D(t) = D(0)(1 - r)^t$ (Crow & Kimura, 1970). The addition of two or more arrangements complicates the situation considerably, and the formulae for the rate of decay of the various disequilibria become complex functions of the various recombination parameters and the frequencies of the chromosome arrangements.

When only two chromosome arrangements are considered, locus-inversion disequilibria decay monotonically at a rate which depends only on the recombination rate between each locus and the inversion (eqn 7). If this recombination is very low, as when the locus is located within the inversion, the formula may be approximated by $D(t) = D(0)e^{-rt}$ (Ishii & Charlesworth, 1977). When a third arrangement is present, however, locus-inversion disequilibria change at rates which are functions of the various recombination rates and the arrangement frequencies (eqn 11). Consequently, they do not always decay but may suffer transient increases due to the flow of alleles between arrangements (Fig. 5). This flow can, given the approximate recombination rates, accelerate the rate of decay of disequilibria. If those disequilibria are maintained by selection, the arrangement mainly facilitating flux (usually the intermediate arrangement) will be selectively eliminated.

The disequilibrium within a particular chromosome arrangement does not decay monotonically but shows a complex rate of change whether two (eqn 7) or three arrangements (eqn 12) are considered. It may even increase temporarily due to the ‘flow’ of disequilibrium from the between components or from the disequilibria within other chromosome arrangements (Figs. 3 and 6). This ‘flow’ is produced by double crossing-over and would not take place if either $r_S = r_A = r_B = 0$, or $r_B = r_0 = 0$. The conversion of the disequilibrium between into disequilibrium within was already noted by Charlesworth (1974, see his table 3). If we assume that recombination is completely suppressed in heterokatyotypes, then the disequilibrium within arrangement $C_t$ decays monotonically at a rate $(1 - u_t r_t)$. This shows that, other things being equal, within disequilibria will have a longer life in the less frequent arrangements. Moreover, the lower the frequency of an arrangement the smaller will be its effective population size $N_{e_t} = u_t 2N_t$; Nei & Li, 1980) and the easier it will be for genetic drift to generate disequilibria within it. Therefore, within disequilibria should be more frequently found in the less frequent arrangements (setting aside problems of statistical power for testing the disequilibria).

The disequilibrium within and the locus-inversion disequilibria have very different dynamics. Our results show that, as a general rule, when $(r_t, r_0) > (r_s, r_0)$, the within disequilibrium will always decay at a faster rate

![Figure 6. Three arrangements. Several oscillations in total disequilibrium (initial conditions: $p_s = p_A = 0.5$, $p_s = p_A = 0.25$, $D_{AB} = D_{AC} = D_{BC} = 0.05$, $D_{ACB} = D_{ABC} = -0.025$, $D_{ABC} = -0.16$, $D_{ABC} = 0.024$, $D_{ABC} = -0.075$, $r_1 = 0.05$, $r_2 = 0.03$, $r_3 = 0.01$, $r_s = r_A = r_B = 0$, $r_0 = 0.001$, $r_0 = 0.005$).](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672300033486) Published online by Cambridge University Press
than the locus-inversion disequilibria. This tendency will decrease with an increasing number of arrangements, but it will still be true when using realistic values for recombination parameters, that is, when recombination rates in heterokaryotypes are as small as $10^{-4}$ or $10^{-5}$ per loci per generation. This is consistent with the more frequent finding of significant disequilibria of the latter type (see Nei and Li, 1980; Sperlich & Pfriem, 1986; Zapata & Álvarez, 1987, 1992; Krimbas & Powell, 1992).

The dynamics of the total disequilibrium between two loci is even more complex because this disequilibrium is made up of several components each decaying at a different rate (eqns 9 and 10). This disequilibrium may also increase temporarily and even show oscillations lasting up to hundreds of generations (Figs. 3 and 6). It should be recalled though that total disequilibrium is not generated de novo, it is only released by recombination from the disequilibrium between and/or within concealed in the initial conditions. If recombination between the two loci and the inversions is assumed to be zero, then the total disequilibrium changes at the rate:

$$D_{AB}(t+1) = D_{AB}(t) - u_1^2 r_1 D_{ABC(1)} - u_2^2 r_2 D_{ABC(2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

This expression shows that even in this simplified situation, the total disequilibrium will exhibit a complex pattern of decay. Its dynamics cannot be described using a single parameter, an effective recombination rate, such as the average frequency of recombination. Instead of that, it is necessary to obtain information about all possible recombination parameters (as in Betrán et al. 1995) to describe the system fully.

The dynamics of disequilibria in a system with chromosome inversions parallel that in a subdivided population with migration (Nei & Li, 1973; Li & Nei, 1974; Feldman & Christiansen, 1975; Tachida, 1994): chromosome arrangements play the role of subpopulations and recombination that of migration. Covariance in gene frequencies between subpopulations generates disequilibria within populations when migration is present. Likewise, when locus-inversion disequilibria are present, double crossing-over and/or conversion generates disequilibria within chromosome arrangements. Migration may also transfer disequilibrium from one subpopulation to another, and again recombination may produce a similar effect. Moreover, disequilibrium in a subdivided population exhibits an oscillatory behaviour similar to that of the total disequilibrium in our system. Of course, when no selection, mutation or drift are involved, both systems will tend towards complete linkage equilibrium. There are, however, important differences which make polymorphic inversions a more complex situation. Firstly, the magnitudes of the implied parameters are very different; migration will generally be greater than recombination in heterokaryotypes. Secondly, while disequilibrium decays at the same rate in all subpopulations, it may change at a different rate within each arrangement; migration will act as double crossing-over or double gene conversion but will not allow single-locus interchanges, i.e. there is no independent locus-inversion recombination. Moreover, any single arrangement added to the system necessarily adds its own (and different) recombination parameters to it, so that a single parameter describing between arrangements interchange, as migration, is not possible. Finally, recombination implies necessarily reciprocal interchange and migration does not.
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Appendix

The recurrence equations are obtained from (7) and (8). In matrix notation those equations may be written as:

$$D(t+1) = RD(t),$$

where $D(t)$ is the $(3 \times 1)$ vector with elements $D_{AB(1)}$, $D_{AB(2)}$, and $D_{AB(3)}$, and $R$ is the following $(3 \times 3)$ matrix:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} (1-r_A)(1-r_B) & 0 & 0 \\ r_A r_B & 1-r_1 u_1 - r_A u_2 - r_B u_2 + r_A r_B u_2 & 0 \\ r_A r_B u_1 & r_A r_B u_1 & 1-r_2 u_2 - r_A u_1 - r_B u_1 + r_A r_B u_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

The eigenvalues for $R$ are $\lambda_1 = (1-r_A)(1-r_B)$, $\lambda_2 = (2+g-b)/2$, $\lambda_3 = (2+g+b)/2$, and the corresponding eigenvectors are:

$$V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \\ f \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ c-b \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ c+b \\ d \end{pmatrix}.$$
where

\[ a = (u_1 u_2(r_1 r_2 + r_2 r_1 - r_1 - r_2) - r_1 r_2(u_1 + u_2)) / (r_1 r_2) \]
\[ b = (u_1 - r_1 - r_2) \times (u_2 - r_1 - r_2) \]
\[ c = r_1^2 + r_2^2 \cdot (u_1 - u_2) - r_1 u_1 + r_2 u_2 \]
\[ d = 2r_1 r_2 u_1 \]
\[ e = u_1 r_2 - r_1 \]
\[ f = u_1 r_1 - r_2 \]
\[ g = (r_1 - r_2) \times (u_1 - u_2) \]

The general recursions are:

\[ D_{BTW}(t) = D_{BTW}(0) \lambda_1^t \]
\[ D_{ABC1D}(t) = k \lambda_1^t + m_1 \lambda_2^t + m_2 \lambda_3^t \]
\[ D_{ABC2D}(t) = \lambda_1^t + m_1 \lambda_3^t + m_2 \lambda_3^t \]

where

\[ k = (D_{BTW}(0) - c) / a \]
\[ j = (D_{BTW}(0) f) / a \]
\[ m_1 = (b - c) (D_{ABC1D}(0) - a(b + c) - D_{BTW}(0) a b / c) / (2a b d) \]
\[ m_2 = (b + c) (D_{ABC2D}(0) - a(b + c) - D_{BTW}(0) a b / c) / (2a b d) \]
\[ n_1 = (D_{ABC1D}(0) b + c - D_{ABC2D}(0) a b + D_{BTW}(0) b c) / (2a b d) \]
\[ n_2 = (D_{ABC2D}(0) a - c - D_{ABC1D}(0) a b + D_{BTW}(0) (b - c)) / (2a b d) \]
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