

# Asymptotic decoupling of population growth rate and cell size distribution

Yair Hein and Farshid Jafarpour

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Utrecht University, 3584 CC Utrecht, Netherlands*

(Dated: October 26, 2023)

The rate at which individual bacterial cells grow depends on the concentrations of cellular components such as ribosomes and proteins. These concentrations continuously fluctuate over time and are inherited from mother to daughter cells leading to correlations between the growth rates of cells across generations. Division sizes of cells are also stochastic and correlated across generations due to a phenomenon known as cell size regulation. Fluctuations and correlations from both growth and division processes affect the population dynamics of an exponentially growing culture. Here, we provide analytic solutions for the population dynamics of cells with continuously fluctuating growth rates coupled with a generic model of cell-size regulation. We show that in balanced growth, the effects of growth and division processes decouple; the population growth rate only depends on the single-cell growth rate process, and the population cell size distribution only depends on the model of division and cell size regulation. The population growth rate is always higher than the average single-cell growth rate, and the difference increases with growth rate variability and its correlation time. This difference also sets the timescale for the population to reach its steady state. We provide analytical solutions for oscillations in population growth rate and traveling waves in size distribution during this approach to the steady state.

For over a century, bacteria have been studied in population experiments in which the number of cells grows exponentially. In the past decade, however, numerous experiments have attempted to uncover models of bacterial growth, division, and cell size control at the single-cell level [1–10]. The details of these single-cell models ultimately determine the dynamics of an exponentially growing population and its population-level observables, such as cell size distribution and population growth rate, the latter of which is an important indicator of population fitness [11–31].

In constant environments, single bacterial cells grow approximately exponentially in size and divide when they roughly double their sizes. However, the division sizes and single-cell growth rates fluctuate and vary from cell to cell [2, 3, 5, 32]. Moreover, the time it takes for a cell to divide is correlated between a mother cell and its daughter cells. There are two distinct sources of correlations. On one hand, if a cell grows for too long before dividing, its daughter cells would be larger than average and would have to divide earlier to compensate for their size; this process is known as cell size regulation, and it induces negative correlations in inter-division times of the mother and daughter cells. On the other hand, cells inherit the concentrations of proteins and ribosomes (which set their instantaneous growth rate) from their mother cells at the moment of division [17, 33–35]. This leads to fast-growing cells having fast-growing daughter cells, which induces positive correlations in inter-division times. These two competing correlations both decay with a comparable timescale of about a couple of generation times [2, 5]. Despite numerous theoretical and experimental attempts, the effects of the fluctuations in growth and division and the two competing sources of correlations in inter-division times on population-level observables are not well understood (the mathematical difficulty of the relationship between single-cell and popula-

tion variables is illustrated in Fig. 1).

In this letter, we introduce a model in which the fluctuations in single cell growth rates are described by a continuous stochastic differential equation and accurately incorporates noise and correlations from both growth and division. We demonstrate a surprising decoupling of population growth rate and the distribution of cell sizes in the population at the steady state: population cell size distribution is determined by the model of division and contains no information about the single-cell growth process, whereas population growth rate is determined solely by the model of single-cell growth dynamics, and is completely unaffected by details of cell division and cell-size regulation. We show that the population growth rate is always larger than the the average single-cell growth rate. This difference is simply the product of two single-cell variables, namely growth rate variability and its correlation time. It follows that both variability and correlations in growth are beneficial to the population fitness, when fixing the time-average growth rate.

In addition to the steady-state results, we have exact solutions for the population dynamics. Previous works have demonstrated that population properties can oscillate for a long time before reaching a steady state [19, 21, 36–40]. Our analytical solutions provide an exact form for the oscillations in the growth rate and the accompanying traveling waves in the cell size distribution. We show that these oscillations decay at a rate proportional to the difference between population growth rate and average single-cell growth rate. These oscillations can therefore last for an unexpectedly long time when the correlation time and growth rate variability are small.

*Model.*—We assume cell sizes grow exponentially with




FIG. 1. Relationship between population properties and single-cell statistics: (A) Lineage tree of a population, two lineages are highlighted. (B) Cell sizes along each lineage grow approximately exponentially and divide by two at the division. (C) Along each lineage, the growth rate fluctuates over time. (D) The state of the population at time  $t$  is characterized by the number of cells and the distributions of their growth rates and sizes. Both the number of cells and their sizes at time  $t$  depend on the history of the stochastically branching tree of stochastic differential equations of growth rates in (C). The growth processes of every two lineages in the tree share a random portion of their history before they branch. The positions of these branches (division times) are random and depend on the size of the cell and also the size at the time of the previous branch (birth size) both of which again depend on the history of the growth rate and the number of earlier divisions. To relate the properties of the population to the single-cell statistics using this highly interconnected and growing set of both continuous and discrete stochastic processes is a daunting task that has consistently forced modelers to make unphysical simplifying assumptions such as ignoring fluctuations or correlations in the growth or in the division process [11–24].

some growth rate  $\lambda_t$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt}v(t) = \lambda_t v(t), \quad (1)$$

at all  $t$  where no division is taking place. The growth rate itself depends on internal protein and ribosome concentrations which fluctuate in time and are inherited by the daughter cells at division [33, 35]. We therefore model the growth rate  $\lambda_t$  by a continuously fluctuating process with a well-defined mean that remains continuous at division. Continuous fluctuations around a well-defined mean are described by the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, characterized by the differential equation

$$\frac{d\lambda_t}{dt} = -\theta(\lambda_t - \bar{\lambda}) + \sigma_\lambda \sqrt{2\theta} \xi(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{\lambda}$  is the mean growth rate,  $\sigma_\lambda^2$  is the growth rate

variance,  $\xi(t)$  is standard Gaussian white noise and  $\theta$  sets the auto-correlation decay rate ( $1/\theta$  is the correlation time). It follows that the growth rate is Gaussian distributed with the covariance  $\text{Cov}(\lambda_t, \lambda_s) = \sigma_\lambda^2 e^{-\theta|t-s|}$ . An example of this process is given in Fig. 1(C).

In general, the division size  $v_{d,n}$  of an  $n$ th-generation cell depends on its birth size and possibly those of its ancestors through a stochastic function  $h$ ,

$$v_{d,n} = h(v_{b,n}, v_{b,n-1}, \dots). \quad (3)$$

The function  $h$  defines the model of division and cell size regulation and determines the steady-state birth size distribution  $f_{v_b}$  (see Refs. [13, 27] for examples of such models). To keep the argument general, we will not specify a model of cell size regulation  $h$ . We will show that the population dynamics is only affected by the birth size distribution  $f_{v_b}$  and is independent of other intricacies of how the birth sizes may be correlated.

*Derivation of Population Properties.*—We start by defining a dimensionless stochastic time as

$$\tau \equiv \int_0^t \lambda_s ds. \quad (4)$$

Since  $\lambda_t$  is Gaussian,  $\tau_t$  is Gaussian too. Its mean and variance are given by

$$\langle \tau_t \rangle = \bar{\lambda} t, \text{ and } \sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = 2 \frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta} t - 2 \frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta^2} (1 - e^{-\theta t}). \quad (5)$$

Dynamics of  $v(\tau)$  in terms of stochastic time simplify to

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} v(\tau) = v(\tau). \quad (6)$$

This follows from the chain rule of differentiation and the fact that  $d\tau_t/dt = \lambda_t$ . By doing this, we absorb all growth fluctuations into the stochastic time, and as such, we get cell size dynamics where the only stochasticity comes from the division noise. Equation (6) now implies that

$$v(\tau) = \frac{v_0 e^\tau}{2^{\Delta(\tau)}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\Delta(\tau)$  is the number of divisions before  $\tau$ . Here  $v_0 e^\tau$  corresponds to the size the cell would have at  $\tau$  if no divisions had taken place, and the factor of  $1/2^{\Delta(\tau)}$  corresponds to the cell having halved its size for a total of  $\Delta(\tau)$  times.

Reference [19] shows that in the absence of growth fluctuations, all the population properties are periodic in time. Since all the growth fluctuations are absorbed into  $\tau$ , the distribution of  $v(\tau)$  would also be periodic with a period of  $\ln(2)$  (see the Supplemental Material, SM [41] for a mathematical proof).

We can now relate the lineage behaviour to the population behaviour. Our first focus is to find the expected population size  $N(t)$  at some time  $t$ . There are  $2^n$  distinct

$n$ -th generation cells in the population tree, each of which can be associated with a unique lineage. These lineages each have the same probability  $P(\Delta(\tau_t) = n)$  of being in the  $n$ -th generation at time  $t$ . Hence, the expected number of  $n$ -th generation cells present at time  $t$  is given by  $2^n P(\Delta(\tau_t) = n)$ . The total expected number of cells is the sum of this quantity over all generations [19, 42, 43]

$$N(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n P(\Delta(\tau_t) = n) = \langle 2^{\Delta(\tau_t)} \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Since divisions are triggered purely by cell size,  $\Delta(\tau_t)$  depends only on  $\tau_t$  and not directly on  $t$ . We may therefore average over  $\Delta(\tau_t)$  and  $\tau_t$  independently,

$$N(t) = \langle \langle 2^{\Delta(\tau_t)} | \tau_t \rangle \rangle \quad (9)$$

By applying Eq. (S18), we can rewrite the inner expected value conditioned to  $\tau_t = \tau$  as

$$\langle 2^{\Delta(\tau)} \rangle = \left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} \right\rangle e^{\tau}. \quad (10)$$

This is where we can use the periodicity of the distribution of  $v(\tau)$ , which implies that  $\langle v_0/v(\tau) \rangle$  is periodic in  $\tau$  with period  $\ln(2)$ . We can therefore expand this function as a Fourier series

$$\left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} \right\rangle = \sum_k c_k e^{ik\omega\tau}, \quad (11)$$

with  $\omega = 2\pi/\ln(2)$ , where  $c_k$ s are constants that depend on the birth size distribution. By combining Eqs. (9), (10) and (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N(t) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k \langle e^{(1+ik\omega)\tau_t} \rangle \\ &= e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\tau_t}^2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k e^{ik\omega(\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_{\tau_t}^2)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}k^2\omega^2\sigma_{\tau_t}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\langle \tau_t \rangle$  and  $\sigma_{\tau_t}^2$  are given by Eq. (S12). At large  $t$  all components become negligible compared to the fastest growing term, which is  $k = 0$ . Hence asymptotically the population grows as

$$N(t) \approx c_0 e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\tau_t}^2}. \quad (13)$$

We may also use this method to find other quantities averaged over a population. If  $x$  is some cell property, its value averaged over all cells in a population snapshot is

$$\langle x \rangle_p = \frac{1}{N(t)} \left\langle x \frac{v_0}{v(\tau_t)} e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where the subscript  $p$  indicates population average. Here  $x$  can be any cell variable, such as instantaneous growth rate  $\lambda_t$  or size  $v(\tau_t)$ . By applying Eq. (14) to Dirac-delta functions  $\delta(\lambda - \lambda_t)$  and  $\delta(v - v(\tau_t))$  we can calculate expected population probability density distributions of

growth rates and sizes respectively.

*Steady-State Population Properties.*—Using Eqs. (S12) and (13), we find a surprisingly simple relationship for the asymptotic population growth rate

$$\Lambda_{\infty} \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N(t)} \frac{dN(t)}{dt} = \bar{\lambda} + \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta}. \quad (15)$$

Population growth rate is remarkably unaffected by the details of the division process. When fixing the lineage time-average cell growth rate  $\bar{\lambda}$ , increasing growth rate variability increases the population growth rate. The difference between population growth rate and single-cell growth rate, given by  $\sigma_{\lambda}^2/\theta$ , can be thought of as the diffusion coefficient of accumulated lineage cell growth, since for large  $t$  we have  $\sigma_{\tau_t}^2 \approx 2(\sigma_{\lambda}^2/\theta)t$ . The result that growth rate variability is always beneficial from the perspective of population growth rate seems to contradict the results of previous work [15, 25]. This difference can be explained by how growth rate variability is defined differently in the previous work. See SM [41] for an in-depth comparison.

The distribution of instantaneous single-cell growth rates in a population snapshot can be obtained by calculating  $\langle \delta(\lambda - \lambda_t) \rangle_p$ . Asymptotically, this distribution converges to a Gaussian distribution with mean  $\Lambda_{\infty}$  and variance  $\sigma_{\lambda}^2$ . Measurements of instantaneous growth rates of cells sampled from populations will thus be higher than those of cells sampled from single lineage experiments. Given that this result is again independent of the details of cell division, it is consistent with Ref. [44] where a similar model of growth is studied neglecting noise and correlations in the division process.

Next, we can calculate the time-dependent size distribution  $G(t, v) = \langle \delta(v - v(\tau_t)) \rangle_p$  using Eq. (14). By taking the asymptotic time limit, we find the stationary distribution of cell sizes in a population snapshot

$$G(v) = \frac{2}{v^2 \langle 1/v_b \rangle} (F_{v_b}(v) - F_{v_b}(v/2)), \quad (16)$$

where  $F_{v_b}$  is the cumulative distribution function of the birth size  $v_b$  (see SM [41] for derivation). When the birth size variability approaches zero,  $F_{v_b}$  becomes a step function and Eq. (16) turns into the well-known ‘‘inverse square law’’ of size distribution for constant birth size [45], characterized by  $G(v) = 2v_b/v^2$  for  $v_b \leq v < 2v_b$  as shown in Fig. 2. Remarkably, Eq. (16) is independent of the growth process (growth rate, its fluctuations, and its correlation time), and as such, it agrees with the size distribution predicted by Powell in 1964 [12], where it was assumed that all cells grow deterministically with the same constant growth rate.

The asymptotic independence of the size distribution from the growth process as well as the independence of population growth rate from the division model hold more generally than the case of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck growth process and symmetric division. They hold when




FIG. 2. Comparison of the size distribution from Eq. (16) (blue solid curve, with birth-size distribution derived from the model of cell-size regulation in Eq. (17)) to histograms of cell sizes from Ref. [46] and the inverse square law (dashed red curve, assuming deterministic division).

growth along a lineage is any continuous stationary process that is unaffected by division (see SM [41] for derivation).

The birth-size distribution in Eq. (16) is determined by the model of division and cell-size control. We introduce a variation of the model from Ref. [13], where cells division size  $v_d$  is determined based on its birth size  $v_b$

$$\ln(v_d) = \alpha \ln(2\bar{v}) + (1 - \alpha) \ln(2v_b) + \eta, \quad (17)$$

where  $\eta$  is a Gaussian random variable with mean zero and variance  $\sigma_\eta^2$ ,  $\bar{v}$  is the constant equilibrium birth size, and  $\alpha$  determines the degree of cell size regulation ( $\alpha = 0$  is the timer model,  $\alpha = 1$  is the sizer model, and  $\alpha = 0.5$  approximates the adder model; see Ref. [13, 27] for more details). This model predicts a log-normal distribution  $f_{v_b}$  for the birth sizes. Figure 2 shows reasonable agreement between the best fit of Eq. (16) with a log-normal  $f_{v_b}$  to experimental cell sizes from Ref. [46]. The slight disagreement in the tail of the size distribution hints at potential non-Gaussianity of the noise term  $\eta$  in cell division.

*Transient Dynamics of Population Properties.*—The dynamics of the number of cells in the population is extremely well approximated by only the zeroth and first order terms from Eq. (12) and the large time behaviour of  $\sigma_{\tau_t}^2$ , which results in

$$N(t) \approx C e^{\Lambda_\infty t} (1 + A \cos(\Omega t + \phi) e^{-qt}), \quad (18)$$

where  $\Omega = \omega(\bar{\lambda} + 2\sigma_\lambda^2/\theta)$ ,  $q = \omega^2\sigma_\lambda^2/\theta$  with  $\omega = 2\pi/\ln(2)$  (the constants  $C$ ,  $A$ , and  $\phi$  can be calculated explicitly as functions of the initial state of the population; see SM [41] for the exact solution). Equation (18) tells us that the population growth rate (defined as  $\Lambda(t) \equiv d\ln(N)/dt$ ) oscillates, and its amplitude decays exponentially with rate  $q$ . The uncorrelated limit ( $\theta \rightarrow \infty$  keeping  $\sigma^2/\theta$  constant) of these oscillations is studied in Ref. [19]. The numerically inferred relationship for the decay rate of these oscillations in Ref. [19] is in perfect agreement with our analytical prediction for  $q$ .

The time-dependent population cell size distribution can be calculated explicitly by taking  $\langle \delta(v - v(\tau_t)) \rangle_p$ . The




FIG. 3. Traveling waves in the dynamics of size distributions: analytically calculated population size distributions are shown at three consecutive times (red solid curves) compared with the first-order approximations (blue dashed curves) and the asymptotic size distribution (green solid curve). Times are given in units of average division times  $\ln(2)/\bar{\lambda}$ . Model parameters:  $\theta = \bar{\lambda} = \ln(2)$ ,  $\sigma_\lambda^2/\theta = 0.006\bar{\lambda}$ ,  $\sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2 = 0.2$ .

first order large time approximation becomes

$$G(t, v) \approx G(v) \frac{1 + B \cos(\Omega t - \omega \ln(v) + \zeta) e^{-qt}}{1 + A \cos(\Omega t + \phi) e^{-qt}}, \quad (19)$$

where  $B$  and  $\zeta$  depend on the initial conditions of the population, and  $G(v)$  is the asymptotic size distribution given by Eq. (16) (see SM [41] for the exact solution). A plot of Eq. (19) is given in Fig. 3, where we compare it to the exact time dependent size distribution and the asymptotic case. We see that the deviation from the asymptotic distribution decays at the rate  $q$ . The parameter  $q$  therefore provides us with a timescale for the internal population properties to reach steady state. In Eq. (19) we also encounter traveling waves in logarithmic cell size densities. These waves propagate at a speed of  $\Omega/\omega = \bar{\lambda} + 2\sigma_\lambda^2/\theta$ . Interestingly, this is faster than the population growth rate  $\Lambda_\infty$  from Eq. (15).

*Discussion.*—Previous works studying the role of growth variability in population dynamics consider the growth rate as a constant random variable associated with each cell and ignore its continuous fluctuations over time [5, 15, 19, 25, 27, 30, 47]. Here, we have shown that if instead of simplified models, we consider a less coarse-grained more accurate model of single-cell growth, the roles of growth and division statistics on population dynamics decouple, and all aspects of population dynamics become analytically solvable.

For the cell size distribution, we have recovered a classical result in Eq. (16) and showed for the first time in nearly 60 years since its discovery [12], that it also holds for fluctuating growth rates. This result implies that a snapshot image of a population of cells cannot be used to extract any information about either the growth process or the mechanism of cell size regulation. However, our time-dependent solution Eq. (19) predicts traveling waves in population size distribution that can be used to infer single-cell growth rate variability.



For the population growth rate, we discovered a remarkably simple relationship in Eq. (15). This equation connects the statistics of growth fluctuations (and therefore fluctuations in concentrations of the underlying molecular components) to the fitness of the organism. This allows for studying (independently of any model of cell division) how these fluctuations at the molecular level are shaped by evolution [48].

Additionally, Eqs. (18) and (19) for the first time, provide closed form solutions for the transient dynamics of the population with realistic models of growth and division.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge Philipp Thomas and Ethan Levien for their comments on the manuscript and Anna Ochab-Marcinek, Marcin Rubin, Jakub Jędrak, and Piotr Wiącek for insightful discussions. This work is part of the D-ITP consortium, a program of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) that is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW).

- 
- [1] Eric J Stewart, Richard Madden, Gregory Paul, and François Taddei, “Aging and death in an organism that reproduces by morphologically symmetric division,” *PLoS Biol.* **3**, e45 (2005).
  - [2] Ping Wang, Lydia Robert, James Pelletier, Wei Lien Dang, François Taddei, Andrew Wright, and Suckjoon Jun, “Robust growth of *escherichia coli*,” *Curr. Biol.* **20**, 1099–1103 (2010).
  - [3] Manuel Campos, Ivan V Surovtsev, Setsu Kato, Ahmad Paintdakhi, Bruno Beltran, Sarah E Ebmeier, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner, “A constant size extension drives bacterial cell size homeostasis,” *Cell* **159**, 1433–1446 (2014).
  - [4] Lydia Robert, Marc Hoffmann, Nathalie Krell, Stéphane Aymerich, Jérôme Robert, and Marie Doumic, “Division in *escherichia coli* triggered by a size-sensing rather than a timing mechanism,” *BMC Biol.* **12**, 1–10 (2014).
  - [5] Sattar Taheri-Araghi, Serena Bradde, John T Sauls, Norbert S Hill, Petra Anne Levin, Johan Paulsson, Massimo Vergassola, and Suckjoon Jun, “Cell-size control and homeostasis in bacteria,” *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 385–391 (2015).
  - [6] Yu Tanouchi, Anand Pai, Heungwon Park, Shuqiang Huang, Nicolas E Buchler, and Lingchong You, “Long-term growth data of *escherichia coli* at a single-cell level,” *Sci. Data* **4**, 1–5 (2017).
  - [7] Prathitha Kar, Sriram Tiruvadi-Krishnan, Jaana Männik, Jaan Männik, and Ariel Amir, “Distinguishing different modes of growth using single-cell data,” *Elife* **10**, e72565 (2021).
  - [8] Harsh Vashistha, Maryam Kohram, and Hanna Salman, “Non-genetic inheritance restraint of cell-to-cell variation,” *Elife* **10**, e64779 (2021).
  - [9] A Golubev, “Applications and implications of the exponentially modified gamma distribution as a model for time variabilities related to cell proliferation and gene expression,” *J. Theor. Biol.* **393**, 203–217 (2016).
  - [10] Niclas Nordholt, Johan H van Heerden, and Frank J Bruggeman, “Biphasic cell-size and growth-rate homeostasis by single *bacillus subtilis* cells,” *Curr. Biol.* **30**, 2238–2247 (2020).
  - [11] EO Powell, “Growth rate and generation time of bacteria, with special reference to continuous culture,” *Microbiology* **15**, 492–511 (1956).
  - [12] EO Powell, “A note on koch & schaechter’s hypothesis about growth and fission of bacteria,” *Microbiology* **37**, 231–249 (1964).
  - [13] Ariel Amir, “Cell size regulation in bacteria,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 208102 (2014).
  - [14] Mikihiro Hashimoto, Takashi Nozoe, Hidenori Nakaoka, Reiko Okura, Sayo Akiyoshi, Kunihiro Kaneko, Edo Kussell, and Yuichi Wakamoto, “Noise-driven growth rate gain in clonal cellular populations,” *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 3251–3256 (2016).
  - [15] Jie Lin and Ariel Amir, “The effects of stochasticity at the single-cell level and cell size control on the population growth,” *Cell Syst.* **5**, 358–367 (2017).
  - [16] Philipp Thomas, “Analysis of cell size homeostasis at the single-cell and population level,” *Front. Phys.* **6**, 64 (2018).
  - [17] Philipp Thomas, Guillaume Terradot, Vincent Danos, and Andrea Y Weiße, “Sources, propagation and consequences of stochasticity in cellular growth,” *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1–11 (2018).
  - [18] Farshid Jafarpour, Charles S Wright, Herman Gudjonson, Jedidiah Riebling, Emma Dawson, Klevin Lo, Aretha Fiebig, Sean Crosson, Aaron R Dinner, and Srividya Iyer-Biswas, “Bridging the timescales of single-cell and population dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021007 (2018).
  - [19] Farshid Jafarpour, “Cell size regulation induces sustained oscillations in the population growth rate,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 118101 (2019).
  - [20] Reinaldo García-García, Arthur Genthon, and David Lacoste, “Linking lineage and population observables in biological branching processes,” *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 042413 (2019).
  - [21] Sean T Vittadello, Scott W McCue, Gency Gunasingh, Nikolas K Haass, and Matthew J Simpson, “Mathematical models incorporating a multi-stage cell cycle replicate normally-hidden inherent synchronization in cell proliferation,” *J. R. Soc. Interface* **16**, 20190382 (2019).
  - [22] Sorin Tănase-Nicola and Pieter Rein Ten Wolde, “Regulatory control and the costs and benefits of biochemical noise,” *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **4**, e1000125 (2008).
  - [23] Philipp Thomas, “Single-cell histories in growing populations: relating physiological variability to population growth,” *bioRxiv*, 100495 (2017).
  - [24] Ethan Levien, Jane Kondev, and Ariel Amir, “The interplay of phenotypic variability and fitness in finite microbial populations,” *J. Vac. Sci. Technol.* **17**, 20190827 (2019).

- (2020).
- [25] Jie Lin and Ariel Amir, “From single-cell variability to population growth,” *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 012401 (2020).
  - [26] Coco van Bortel, Johan H van Heerden, Niclas Nordholt, Philipp Schmidt, and Frank J Bruggeman, “Taking chances and making mistakes: non-genetic phenotypic heterogeneity and its consequences for surviving in dynamic environments,” *J. R. Soc. Interface* **14**, 20170141 (2017).
  - [27] Po-Yi Ho, Jie Lin, and Ariel Amir, “Modeling cell size regulation: From single-cell-level statistics to molecular mechanisms and population-level effects,” *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* **47**, 251–271 (2018).
  - [28] Takashi Nozoe and Edo Kussell, “Cell cycle heritability and localization phase transition in growing populations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 268103 (2020).
  - [29] Arthur Genthon, “Analytical cell size distribution: lineage-population bias and parameter inference,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06146* (2022).
  - [30] Felix Barber, Jiseon Min, Andrew W Murray, and Ariel Amir, “Modeling the impact of single-cell stochasticity and size control on the population growth rate in asymmetrically dividing cells,” *PLoS Comp. Bio.* **17**, e1009080 (2021).
  - [31] Chen Jia, Abhyudai Singh, and Ramon Grima, “Cell size distribution of lineage data: analytic results and parameter inference,” *Iscience* **24**, 102220 (2021).
  - [32] Dan Pirjol, Farshid Jafarpour, and Srividya Iyer-Biswas, “Phenomenology of stochastic exponential growth,” *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 062406 (2017).
  - [33] Daniel J Kiviet, Philippe Nghe, Noreen Walker, Sarah Boulineau, Vanda Sunderlikova, and Sander J Tans, “Stochasticity of metabolism and growth at the single-cell level,” *Nature* **514**, 376–379 (2014).
  - [34] Jie Lin and Ariel Amir, “Disentangling intrinsic and extrinsic gene expression noise in growing cells,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 078101 (2021).
  - [35] Istvan T Kleijn, Laurens HJ Krah, and Rutger Hermesen, “Noise propagation in an integrated model of bacterial gene expression and growth,” *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **14**, e1006386 (2018).
  - [36] G Chiorino, JAJ Metz, D Tomasoni, and P Ubezio, “Desynchronization rate in cell populations: mathematical modeling and experimental data,” *J. Theor. Biol.* **208**, 185–199 (2001).
  - [37] Enrico Gavagnin, Sean T. Vittadello, Gency Gunasingh, Nikolas K. Haass, Matthew J. Simpson, Tim Rogers, and Christian A. Yates, “Synchronized oscillations in growing cell populations are explained by demographic noise,” *Biophysical Journal* **120**, 1314–1322 (2021).
  - [38] AW Brown, “A note on the use of a pearson type iii function in renewal theory,” *Ann. Math. Stat.* **11**, 448–453 (1940).
  - [39] David G Kendall, “On the role of variable generation time in the development of a stochastic birth process,” *Biometrika* **35**, 316–330 (1948).
  - [40] Henry R Hirsch and Joseph Engelberg, “Decay of cell synchronization: solutions of the cell-growth equation,” *Bull. math. biophys.* **28**, 391–409 (1966).
  - [41] See Supplemental Material for proof of periodicity of distribution of  $v(\tau_i)$ , derivation of birth size distribution and growth rate distribution, a more general derivation of the decoupling, exact solutions for the dynamics of the number of cells and the distribution of cell sizes, and the relationship to the discretely varying growth rate model.
  - [42] Ethan Levien, Trevor GrandPre, and Ariel Amir, “Large deviation principle linking lineage statistics to fitness in microbial populations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 048102 (2020).
  - [43] Simone Pigolotti, “Generalized euler-lotka equation for correlated cell divisions,” *arXiv:2101.02403* (2021).
  - [44] Ethan Levien, Jiseon Min, Jane Kondev, and Ariel Amir, “Non-genetic variability in microbial populations: survival strategy or nuisance?” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **84**, 116601 (2021).
  - [45] AL Koch and M Schaechter, “A model for statistics of the cell division process,” *Microbiology* **29**, 435–454 (1962).
  - [46] William T Gray, Sander K Govers, Yingjie Xiang, Bradley R Parry, Manuel Campos, Sangjin Kim, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner, “Nucleoid size scaling and intracellular organization of translation across bacteria,” *Cell* **177**, 1632–1648 (2019), data shown for *E. coli* strain CJW6723 grown in a M9gly medium at 30°C.
  - [47] Andrew Marantan and Ariel Amir, “Stochastic modeling of cell growth with symmetric or asymmetric division,” *Physical Review E* **94**, 012405 (2016).
  - [48] Farshid Jafarpour, Ethan Levien, and Ariel Amir, “Evolutionary dynamics in non-markovian models of microbial populations,” *bioRxiv* (2022).
  - [49] Rakhi N Bhattacharya, “On the functional central limit theorem and the law of the iterated logarithm for markov processes,” *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **60**, 185–201 (1982).
-

*Supplemental Material for:*  
 Asymptotic decoupling of growth rate and cell-size distribution  
 Yair Hein and Farshid Jafarpour

## I. OBTAINING A STEADY-STATE BIRTH SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Here we show how a model like the one introduced in Ref. [13] leads to identically distributed birth sizes. Consider a cell born with size  $v_{b,n}$ , with  $n$  denoting the generation of the cell considered within some fixed lineage. It will attempt to divide at some size  $v_{d,n} = h(v_{b,n})$ , that depends only on the cell's birth size. This function is defined such that

$$\ln(v_{d,n}) = \alpha \ln(2\bar{v}) + (1 - \alpha) \ln(2v_{b,n}) + \eta_n \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $\eta_n$  is an independent Gaussian noise parameter with mean 0 and variance  $\sigma_\eta^2$ ,  $\bar{v}$  is the equilibrium birth size and  $\alpha$  is some constant that interpolates between different models of cell size control. For  $\alpha = 1$ , there is no dependency on birth size and we obtain what is known as the sizer model. For  $\alpha = 0$ , one can show that the ratio  $v_{d,n}/v_{b,n}$  becomes independent of  $v_{b,n}$  and we obtain a model that is equivalent to the timer model. For  $\alpha = 1/2$ , we obtain a model that is an approximation for the model where cells roughly add a constant size  $\bar{v}$  to their birth size upon division, known as the adder model. In our simulations we will assume that  $\alpha = 1/2$ , since the adder model seems to most closely correspond to experimental findings [5].

Under the assumption of symmetric division, birth sizes are half the sizes of their mother cells at division, meaning  $v_{b,n+1} = v_{d,n}/2$ , so we obtain a recursive formula for the birth sizes

$$\ln\left(\frac{v_{b,n+1}}{\bar{v}}\right) = (1 - \alpha) \ln\left(\frac{v_{b,n}}{\bar{v}}\right) + \eta_n. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Now suppose the birth size of our starting cell  $v_{b,0}$  is fixed, then the  $n$ -th cell in our lineage will have its birth size given by

$$\ln\left(\frac{v_{b,n}}{\bar{v}}\right) = (1 - \alpha)^n \ln\left(\frac{v_{b,0}}{\bar{v}}\right) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 - \alpha)^{n-1-i} \eta_i, \quad (\text{S3})$$

hence  $\ln(v_{b,n})$  will be Gaussian with mean

$$\langle \ln(v_{b,n}) \rangle = \ln(\bar{v}) + (1 - \alpha)^n \ln\left(\frac{v_{b,0}}{\bar{v}}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln(\bar{v}), \quad (\text{S4})$$

and variance

$$\sigma_{\ln(v_{b,n})}^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 - \alpha)^{2i} \sigma_\eta^2 = \frac{1 - (1 - \alpha)^{2n}}{\alpha(2 - \alpha)} \sigma_\eta^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\alpha(2 - \alpha)} \sigma_\eta^2. \quad (\text{S5})$$

In distribution, the birth sizes  $v_{b,n}$  now quickly converge to some asymptotic log-normal distribution  $v_b$  such that  $\ln(v_b)$  has mean  $\ln(\bar{v})$  and variance  $\sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2 = \sigma_\eta^2 / \alpha(2 - \alpha)$ . One can check that this is a steady-state distribution of equation (S2). Thus if we assume  $v_{b,0}$  is unknown and starts off in the steady state distribution, then all subsequent cells will also have this distribution. This is what we used in the main text. Note that even if the initial birth size is known and fixed, the subsequent birth size distributions would converge back to the steady-state distribution so rapidly, that after a few generations it hardly matters whether the birth sizes follow equation (S2) or its corresponding steady state distribution.

## II. THE PROPERTIES OF AN ORNSTEIN-UHLENBECK GROWTH RATE PROCESS

In this section we define the growth rate process and derive some properties of this process and the distribution of the stochastic time (which is defined as the integral over the growth rate).

In the main text we defined our growth rate  $\lambda_t$  as the stochastic process satisfying the Langevin-equation

$$\frac{d\lambda_t}{dt} = -\theta(\lambda_t - \bar{\lambda}) + \sigma_\lambda \sqrt{2\theta} \xi(t), \quad (\text{S6})$$

with time-average growth rate  $\bar{\lambda}$ , instantaneous growth rate variance  $\sigma_\lambda^2$ , auto-correlation decay rate  $\theta$  and a Gaussian white noise process  $\xi(t)$  that satisfies  $\langle \xi(t) \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle \xi(t)\xi(s) \rangle = \delta(t-s)$ . The solution to equation (S6) is

$$\lambda_t = \bar{\lambda} + (\lambda_0 - \bar{\lambda})e^{-\theta t} + \sigma_\lambda \sqrt{2\theta} e^{-\theta t} \int_0^t e^{\theta s} \xi(s) ds \quad (\text{S7})$$

Due to the properties of  $\xi(s)$ , growth rate  $\lambda_t$  is a gaussian with mean

$$\langle \lambda_t \rangle = \bar{\lambda} + (\lambda_0 - \bar{\lambda})e^{-\theta t} \quad \text{Var}(\lambda_t) = \langle (\lambda_t - \langle \lambda_t \rangle)^2 \rangle = \sigma_\lambda^2 (1 - e^{-2\theta t}) \quad (\text{S8})$$

and auto-correlation

$$\text{Cov}(\lambda_t, \lambda_s) = \langle (\lambda_t - \langle \lambda_t \rangle)(\lambda_s - \langle \lambda_s \rangle) \rangle = \sigma_\lambda^2 (e^{-\theta|t-s|} - e^{-\theta(t+s)}) \quad (\text{S9})$$

When  $t, s \gg 1/\theta$ ,  $\lambda_t$  reaches a steady state with mean, variance and auto-correlation

$$\langle \lambda_t \rangle = \bar{\lambda}, \quad \text{Var}(\lambda_t) = \sigma_\lambda^2, \quad \text{Cov}(\lambda_t, \lambda_s) = \sigma_\lambda^2 e^{-\theta|t-s|}, \quad (\text{S10})$$

Alternatively if  $\lambda_0$  is unknown and assumed to be in the steady state distribution characterized by equation (S10), then  $\lambda_t$  will stay in the steady-state distribution satisfy (S10) for all times. We could have easily fixed  $\lambda_0$  and used equations (S8) (S9) in the rest of our theory, but for the sake of simplicity, we decided to opt for the steady-state process satisfying equation (S9) in the main text.

We defined the dimensionless stochastic time by

$$\tau_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s ds \quad (\text{S11})$$

Since  $\lambda_t$  is always Gaussian,  $\tau_t$  must be Gaussian too. We can fully characterize its distribution by its mean and variance. The mean is

$$\langle \tau_t \rangle = \int_0^t \bar{\lambda} ds = \bar{\lambda} t \quad (\text{S12})$$

and its variance is

$$\sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = \int_0^t \int_0^t \text{Cov}(\lambda_s, \lambda_u) ds du = \sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t e^{-\theta|u-s|} ds du. \quad (\text{S13})$$

Due to the symmetry of the integrand in  $s-u$ , the integrals over the domain halves  $s-u \leq 0$  and  $s-u \geq 0$  will yield the same value, so the integral over either domain half will be half the value of the full integral. We find

$$\sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = 2\sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \int_0^s e^{\theta(u-s)} ds du = 2\sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{\theta} (1 - e^{-\theta s}) ds = 2\frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta} \left( t - \frac{1}{\theta} (1 - e^{-\theta t}) \right) \quad (\text{S14})$$

In the rest of the text, unless stated otherwise, we assume the growth rate satisfies Eq. (S6). What we have shown here is that for such a process, the stochastic time defined by Eq. (S11) is normally distributed where its mean and variance are given by Eqs. (S12) and (S14)

### III. THE LINEAGE CELL SIZE FUNCTION IS PERIODIC

In this section we derive the relationship between cell size, division history and stochastic time. We then use this relationship to show that cell size is a periodic function of stochastic time. All of the results derived in this section hold for any choice of growth rate  $\lambda_t$



The cell size function of time was initially defined as

$$\frac{d}{dt}v(t) = \lambda_t v(t) \quad (\text{S15})$$

in all  $t$  where no division is taking place. Though the mechanism described in section I, we obtain an array of division sizes  $(v_{d,0}, v_{d,1}, \dots)$ . A division happens when  $v(t)$  reaches the next division size from this array. Upon a division,  $v(t)$  discontinuously jumps to half its value  $v(t)/2$ .

We also impose the initial condition  $v(0) = v_0$ . One may raise the point that this initial condition affects the information we have about the birth size of the initial cell, which contradicts the steady-state assumption of the birth sizes made in section I. We can work around this by assuming  $t$  is large enough for the steady-state approximation of  $v_{d,n}$  to hold for all cells in the population.

Let us now define the cell size function of stochastic time as the function satisfying

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}v(\tau) = v(\tau) \quad (\text{S16})$$

for  $\tau$  where no division is taking place. This function also halves its value whenever it reaches the next division size taken from the same array  $v_{d,0}, v_{d,1}, v_{d,2}, \dots$ . We connect these cell size functions by evaluating the stochastic time cell size in  $\tau_t$ , as defined in equation (S11). Note that

$$\frac{d}{dt}v(\tau_t) = \frac{d\tau_t}{dt} \frac{d}{d\tau_t}v(\tau_t) = \lambda_t \frac{d}{d\tau_t}v(\tau_t) = \lambda_t v(\tau_t), \quad (\text{S17})$$

where we used equation (S16) and the fact that  $d\tau_t/dt = \lambda_t$ . It follows that  $v(\tau_t)$  as a function of  $t$  satisfies equation (S15). It also has the same division behaviour as the cell size function of time, hence  $v(\tau_t) = v(t)$ .

As argued in the main text, we can express the cell size at any point as

$$v(\tau) = v_0 \frac{1}{2^{\Delta(\tau)}} e^\tau, \quad (\text{S18})$$

where  $\Delta(\tau)$  is the total number of divisions that have taken place before stochastic time  $\tau$ . The right-hand side of equation (S18) simply satisfies the definition of  $v(\tau)$ , which proves the equation.

Now we will show the periodicity of  $v(\tau)$ . Let  $\tau_{b,1}, \tau_{b,2}, \dots$  be the birth times such that  $\Delta(\tau_{b,n}) = n$ . Since  $\Delta(\tau)$  does not increase outside of division events, we have that for any  $\tau$

$$\Delta(\tau) = \sup\{n \geq 0 : \tau_{b,n} \leq \tau\} \quad (\text{S19})$$

note that equation (S18) can be inverted to express the stochastic time in terms of the other variables as

$$\tau = \ln(2)\Delta(\tau) - \ln\left(\frac{v_0}{v(\tau)}\right). \quad (\text{S20})$$

This now allows us to express the birth times in terms of the other variables as

$$\tau_{b,n} = n \ln(2) - \ln\left(\frac{v_0}{v_{b,n}}\right), \quad (\text{S21})$$

hence we can rewrite equation (S19) as

$$\Delta(\tau) = \sup\left\{n \geq 0 : n \ln(2) - \ln\left(\frac{v_0}{v_{b,n}}\right) \leq \tau\right\} \quad (\text{S22})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\tau + \ln(2)) - 1 &= \sup\left\{n \geq 0 : n \ln(2) - \ln\left(\frac{v_0}{v_{b,n}}\right) \leq \tau + \ln(2)\right\} - 1 \\ &= \sup\left\{n \geq -1 : n \ln(2) - \ln\left(\frac{v_0}{v_{b,n+1}}\right) \leq \tau\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S23})$$

which has the same distribution as simply  $\Delta(\tau)$ . It follows that

$$v(\tau + \ln(2)) = v_0 \frac{1}{2^{\Delta(\tau + \ln(2))}} e^{\tau + \ln(2)} = \frac{1}{2^{\Delta(\tau + \ln(2)) - 1}} e^\tau \quad (\text{S24})$$

has the same distribution as  $v(\tau)$ , therefore the distribution of  $v(\tau)$  must be periodic in  $\tau$  with a period  $\ln(2)$ .

#### IV. DERIVING THE TOTAL POPULATION FORMULA

Here we will more rigorously link the expected total population  $N(t)$  to the cell statistics along a single lineage. We will initially derive a general expression for the population total that holds for any type of growth rate process. For each generation  $n$ , starting from  $n = 0$ , there are  $2^n$  distinct cells in the population tree. Every cell can therefore be characterized by its generation  $n$  and some index  $1 \leq j \leq 2^n$ . By  $\Delta^j$  and  $\tau_t^j$  we denote the the number of divisions and stochastic time at time  $t$  respectively for some lineage containing cell  $j$ . A cell  $j$  is present in the population at time  $t$  if the total number of divisions at that time equals the generation of the cell. The total number of cells  $\tilde{N}(t)$  can thus be obtained by counting the number of cells satisfying the condition  $\Delta^j(\tau_t^j) = n$ , which is

$$\tilde{N}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \delta_{\Delta^j(\tau_t^j), n} \quad (\text{S25})$$

where  $\delta$  is a Kronecker delta. The expected number of cells at time  $t$  is

$$N(t) = \langle \tilde{N}(t) \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \langle \delta_{\Delta^j(\tau_t^j), n} \rangle \quad (\text{S26})$$

The expectation value of a Kronecker delta is always equal to the probability of it being one, which is the probability that  $\Delta^j(\tau_t^j) = n$ . Since this probability is independent of the lineage considered, we can drop the dependency on  $j$ , hence

$$N(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \mathbb{P}(\Delta(\tau_t) = n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \mathbb{P}(\Delta(\tau_t) = n) = \langle 2^{\Delta(\tau_t)} \rangle \quad (\text{S27})$$

Let us now consider this expectation value conditioned to stochastic time  $\tau_t = \tau$ , denoted by  $\hat{N}(\tau) = \langle 2^{\Delta(\tau)} \rangle$ . Using equation (S18), we rewrite this as

$$\hat{N}(\tau) = \left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} \right\rangle e^{\tau} \quad (\text{S28})$$

In section III we argued why the distribution of  $v(\tau)$  is periodic with a period of  $\ln(2)$ . It follows that  $\langle v_0/v(\tau) \rangle$  is a periodic function of  $\tau$  with a period of  $\ln(2)$ . We may therefore Fourier expand this expression as

$$\left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} \right\rangle = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{i\omega k \tau} \quad (\text{S29})$$

with  $\omega = 2\pi/\ln(2)$  and where  $c_k$  are complex numbers that depend on the behaviour of  $\langle v_0/v(\tau) \rangle$ . We can plug equation (S29) into equation (S28) and obtain

$$\hat{N}(\tau) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau}. \quad (\text{S30})$$

Since  $\tau_t$  is a normal distribution, we can now exactly derive the expected total population at time  $t$  as

$$N(t) = \langle \hat{N}(\tau_t) \rangle = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k \langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \rangle \quad (\text{S31})$$

*The total population when growth rate is Ornstein-Uhlenbeck*

Let us now again assume that  $\lambda_t$  is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and that hence  $\tau_t$  is Gaussian with its mean  $\langle \tau_t \rangle$  and variance  $\sigma_{\tau}^2$  given by Eqs. (S12) and (S14). Since  $\tau_t$  is now Gaussian, we may further evaluate Eq. (S31) to

$$N(t) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{(1+i\omega k)\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2}(1+i\omega k)^2 \sigma_{\tau_t}^2}, \quad (\text{S32})$$

By factoring out the exponential of the fastest growing term  $k = 0$ , we obtain the expression from the main text

$$N(t) = e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\tau_t}^2} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{i\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_{\tau_t}^2)} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_{\tau_t}^2}. \quad (\text{S33})$$

If there were no growth rate variability, we would have  $\sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = 0$  and the population would oscillate forever. This is something that has also been concluded in Ref. [19] in the case of constant growth rate. The spread in stochastic time caused by growth rate variability causes the relative amplitudes of all the oscillatory components in equation (S33) to decrease with time. We can read off that  $e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\tau_t}^2}$  is the leading exponential behaviour of the population,  $e^{i\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_{\tau_t}^2)}$  capture the oscillating behaviour of the  $k \neq 0$  terms,  $c_k$  are their initial amplitudes and  $e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_{\tau_t}^2}$  capture their decay relative to the leading term

Let us rewrite equation (S33) to get rid of all complex components. Since all coefficients satisfy  $c_k^* = c_{-k}$ , we can take all positive and negative  $k$  terms together.

$$N(t) = e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\tau_t}^2} \left[ c_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2|c_k| \cos(\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_{\tau_t}^2) + \text{Arg}(c_k)) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_{\tau_t}^2} \right] \quad (\text{S34})$$

After a few generations we can easily approximate equation (S14) by

$$\sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = 2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta} t - 2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2} \quad (\text{S35})$$

Equation (S34) can now be rewritten as

$$N(t) = C e^{\Lambda_{\infty} t} \left[ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k \cos(k\Omega t + \phi_k) e^{-k^2 q t} \right], \quad (\text{S36})$$

with fundamental factors of time given by

$$\Lambda_{\infty} = \bar{\lambda} + \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta}, \quad \Omega = \omega \left( \bar{\lambda} + 2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta} \right), \quad q = \omega^2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta}, \quad (\text{S37})$$

and initial condition dependent constants given by

$$C = c_0 e^{-2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2}}, \quad A_k = 2 \frac{|c_k|}{c_0} e^{\omega^2 k^2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2}}, \quad \phi_k = \text{Arg}(c_k) - 2\omega k \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2} \quad (\text{S38})$$

#### Calculating the coefficients

In this section we will discuss how the coefficients  $c_k$  are related to the birth size distribution and initial conditions. From the Fourier expansion in equation (S29), it follows that

$$c_k = \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \int_x^{x+\ln(2)} \left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} \right\rangle e^{-i\omega k \tau} d\tau, \quad (\text{S39})$$

where  $x$  can be any real number large enough for  $v(\tau)$  to have reached steady-state. Due to cell size homeostasis there must be some finite interval on which all birth sizes lie with full certainty. We assume that all log birth sizes lie within some interval of length  $\ln(2)$ . Though this is not always true in nature, it does hold by approximation and it simplifies our calculations a lot. Suppose  $y$  is such that  $\ln(v_{b,n}) \in (y, y + \ln(2))$ . Choose  $x = y + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0)$ , with  $n$  large enough for  $v_{b,n}$  to be in steady-state. Using equation (S21), we find that

$$\tau_{b,n} \in (x, x + \ln(2)) \quad (\text{S40})$$

and that all other times of birth fall outside of this interval. For all  $\tau$  considered in the integral in equation (S39), the division count can only take on two values, depending on whether the one division occurred before or after  $\tau$ .

$$\Delta(\tau) = \begin{cases} n-1 & \text{if } \tau \leq \tau_{b,n} \\ n & \text{if } \tau > \tau_{b,n} \end{cases} \quad (\text{S41})$$

It follows that

$$\frac{v_0}{v(\tau)} = e^{-\tau} (2^{n-1} \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq \tau_{b,n}\} + 2^n \mathbb{1}\{\tau > \tau_{b,n}\}), \quad (\text{S42})$$

where  $\mathbb{1}$  is an indicator function that equals 1 when the condition in the brackets is satisfied and 0 otherwise. We can evaluate this function in a shifted position and find that

$$\frac{v_0}{v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0))} = v_0 e^{-\tau} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq \ln(v_{b,n})\} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > \ln(v_{b,n})\} \right) \quad (\text{S43})$$

its expectation value can be obtained by integrating over the possible values of the one birth size of interest

$$\left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0))} \right\rangle = v_0 e^{-\tau} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} f_{\ln(v_b)}(u) \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq u\} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > u\} \right) du \quad (\text{S44})$$

Now we perform a shift in the integral of equation (S39) of  $\tau \rightarrow \tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0)$ , plug in equation (S44) and switch the order of integration to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_k &= \frac{1}{\ln(2)} e^{i\omega k \ln(v_0)} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} \left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0))} \right\rangle e^{-i\omega k \tau} d\tau \\ &= \frac{v_0}{\ln(2)} e^{i\omega k \ln(v_0)} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} f_{\ln(v_b)}(u) \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} e^{-(1+i\omega k)\tau} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq u\} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > u\} \right) d\tau du \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S45})$$

The inner integral can be evaluated for a given  $u$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} e^{-(1+i\omega k)\tau} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq u\} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > u\} \right) d\tau &= \frac{1}{2} \int_y^u e^{-(1+i\omega k)\tau} d\tau + \int_u^{y+\ln(2)} e^{-(1+i\omega k)\tau} d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{1+i\omega k} \left( \frac{1}{2} e^{-(1+i\omega k)y} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-(1+i\omega k)u} + e^{-(1+i\omega k)u} - e^{-(1+i\omega k)(y+\ln(2))} \right) = \frac{1}{1+i\omega k} \frac{1}{2} e^{-(1+i\omega k)u}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S46})$$

Plugging this back into equation (S45) results in

$$c_k = \frac{v_0 e^{i\omega k \ln(v_0)}}{2 \ln(2) (1+i\omega k)} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} f_{\ln(v_b)}(u) e^{-(1+i\omega k)u} du. \quad (\text{S47})$$

We can calculate these more explicitly if we assume that  $v_b$  is log-normal with  $\langle \ln(v_b) \rangle = \ln(\bar{v})$  and variance  $\sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2$ . For simplicity we think of  $\sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2$  as small enough to the point where it doesn't matter if we take the integral over all of space instead of the finite interval. We obtain

$$c_k = \frac{v_0}{\bar{v}} \frac{e^{i\omega k (\ln(v_0/\bar{v}) + \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2)}}{2 \ln(2) (1+i\omega k)} e^{\frac{1-\omega^2 k^2}{2} \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2}. \quad (\text{S48})$$

This can be used to obtain more explicit forms of the constants from equation (S38), namely

$$C = \frac{v_0}{\bar{v}} \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2}}{2 \ln(2)} e^{-2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2}}, \quad A_k = \frac{2 e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2}}{\sqrt{1 + \omega^2 k^2}} e^{\omega^2 k^2 \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2}} \quad (\text{S49})$$

and

$$\phi_k = \omega k \left( \ln(v_0/\bar{v}) + \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2 \right) - \arctan(\omega k) - 2\omega k \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta^2} \quad (\text{S50})$$

## V. DERIVING THE GENERAL EXPRESSION FOR POPULATION PROPERTIES

In this section we derive a general expression for the expected value of any single-cell dependent variable over a population. Any of the following results will hold regardless of whether  $\lambda_t$  is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process or not.

Let  $x_t^j$  be some value related to cell  $j$ , like cell size  $v^j(t)$  or growth rate  $\lambda_t^j$ . We define the total value  $\tilde{X}(t)$  as the sum of  $x_t^j$  over all cells in the population at time  $t$ . This sum can be obtained by summing over  $x_t^j$  over all cells within the population tree but with  $x_t^j$  multiplied by zero if  $j$  is not in the population and by one otherwise. We can thus write

$$\tilde{X}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} x_t^j \delta_{\Delta^j(\tau_t^j), n}. \quad (\text{S51})$$

In analogy to equation (S26), we find that the expected total sum of  $x_t^j$  over all cells is given by

$$X(t) = \langle \tilde{X}(t) \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \langle x_t^j \delta_{\Delta^j(\tau_t^j), n} \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \langle x_t \delta_{\Delta(\tau_t), n} \rangle \quad (\text{S52})$$

where in the last equality we again used the fact that the distributions of cell properties are lineage independent. For each term we can now put the factor two within the expectation brackets and replace  $n$  by  $\Delta(\tau_t)$  due to the presence of the Kronecker delta. We obtain

$$X(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle x_t 2^{\Delta(\tau_t)} \delta_{\Delta(\tau_t), n} \rangle = \langle x_t 2^{\Delta(\tau_t)} \rangle = \left\langle x_t \frac{v_0}{v(\tau_t)} e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle \quad (\text{S53})$$

The average value of  $x_t$  per cell in the population can now simply be obtained by dividing this total by the expected number of cells, hence

$$\langle x_t \rangle_p = \frac{X(t)}{N(t)} = \frac{1}{N(t)} \left\langle x_t \frac{v_0}{v(\tau_t)} e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle \quad (\text{S54})$$

By setting  $x_t$  to  $\delta(\lambda_t - \lambda)$  or  $\delta(v(\tau_t) - v)$  one can calculate the time-dependent distributions of  $\lambda_t$  and  $v(\tau_t)$  respectively.

## VI. DERIVING THE POPULATION GROWTH RATE DISTRIBUTION

In this section we assume that  $\lambda_t$  is given by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The growth rate distribution in a population at time  $t$  is given by

$$\rho(t, \lambda) = \langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) \rangle_p = \frac{1}{N(t)} \left\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) \frac{v_0}{v(\tau_t)} e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle \quad (\text{S55})$$

The only dependency on the division process in this expression comes from  $v_0/v(\tau_t)$  again, hence we may first average over the division process independently from  $\tau_t$  and  $\lambda_t$

$$\rho(t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{N(t)} \left\langle \left\langle \frac{v_0}{v(\tau_t)} \right| \tau_t \right\rangle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle_{\tau_t, \lambda_t} \quad (\text{S56})$$

We may now plug in the Fourier expansion from equation (S29) to obtain

$$\rho(t, \lambda) = \frac{1}{N(t)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k \left\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{S57})$$

Let us now calculate the expectation values

$$\left\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \right\rangle = \left\langle \left\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \right| \lambda_t \right\rangle \right\rangle = \langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) \rangle \left\langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \right| \lambda_t = \lambda \rangle. \quad (\text{S58})$$

Note that  $\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) \rangle$  must simply be equal to the steady-state distribution of  $\lambda_t$ , which is Gaussian with mean  $\bar{\lambda}$  and variance  $\sigma_{\lambda}^2$ . In order to solve the rightmost factor in equation (S58), we notice that the distribution of  $\tau_t$  is unaffected by a growth process time-reversal of  $\lambda_s \rightarrow \lambda_{t-s}$ . Fixing the final growth rate as  $\lambda_t = \lambda$  will therefore have the same effect as fixing the initial growth rate as  $\lambda_0 = \lambda$ . Using equations (S8) and (S9), we can calculate the mean and variance of  $\tau_t$  given that  $\lambda_0 = \lambda$  is fixed, so

$$\langle \tau_t \rangle_0 = \int_0^t \langle \lambda_s \rangle_0 = \int_0^t \bar{\lambda} + (\lambda_0 - \bar{\lambda}) e^{-\theta s} ds = \bar{\lambda} t + (\lambda_0 - \bar{\lambda}) \frac{1}{\theta} (1 - e^{-\theta t}) \quad (\text{S59})$$



and

$$\sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2 = \int_0^t \int_0^t \text{Cov}(\lambda_s, \lambda_u) du ds = \sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t e^{-\theta|u-s|} du ds - \sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t e^{-\theta(t+s)} du ds. \quad (\text{S60})$$

Note that the left integral on the right-hand side is equal to the old stochastic time variance. We therefore find

$$\sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2 = \sigma_{\tau_t}^2 - \sigma_\lambda^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t e^{-\theta(u+s)} du ds = \sigma_{\tau_t}^2 - \sigma_\lambda^2 \frac{1}{\theta^2} (1 - e^{-\theta t})^2 = 2 \frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta} t - \frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta^2} (3 - 4e^{-\theta t} + e^{-2\theta t}) \quad (\text{S61})$$

We can now use this to calculate the aforementioned conditional expectation

$$\left\langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} | \lambda_t = \lambda \right\rangle = e^{(1+i\omega k)\langle \tau_t \rangle_0 + \frac{1}{2}(1+i\omega k)^2 \sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2} \quad (\text{S62})$$

with  $\langle \tau_t \rangle_0$  and  $\sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2$  given by equations (S59) and (S61) respectively. We find

$$\left\langle \delta(\lambda_t - \lambda) e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_\lambda^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\lambda^2}(\lambda - \bar{\lambda})^2} e^{(1+i\omega k)\langle \tau_t \rangle_0 + \frac{1}{2}(1+i\omega k)^2 \sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2} \quad (\text{S63})$$

One could plug this expression into equation (S57) to obtain the full analytical dynamic population cell growth distribution. To get the asymptotic growth rate distribution we send  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In this limit, all  $k \neq 0$  terms as well as all  $e^{-\theta t}$  vanish. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{N(t)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_\lambda^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\lambda^2}(\lambda - \bar{\lambda})^2} e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle_0 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\tau_t,0}^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_\lambda^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\lambda^2}(\lambda - \bar{\lambda})^2} e^{\frac{1}{\theta}(\lambda - \bar{\lambda}) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sigma_\lambda^2}{\theta^2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_\lambda^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\lambda^2}(\lambda - \Lambda_\infty)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S64})$$

with  $\Lambda_\infty = \bar{\lambda} + \sigma_\lambda^2/\theta$ . Hence in a steady-state population, instantaneous growth rate is normally distributed with mean  $\Lambda_\infty$  and variance  $\sigma_\lambda^2$

## VII. DERIVING THE POPULATION CELL SIZE DISTRIBUTION

In this section we derive the time-dependent population cell size distribution. first we will derive a general expression that does not assume the specifics of the growth rate process  $\lambda_t$ . To find the cell size distribution of the population at time  $t$ , we apply Eq. (S54) to the Dirac-delta function to obtain

$$G(t, v) = \langle \delta(v(\tau_t) - v) \rangle_p = \frac{1}{N(t)} \left\langle \delta(v(\tau_t) - v) \frac{v_0}{v} e^{\tau_t} \right\rangle \quad (\text{S65})$$

To solve this, we first average over values of  $v(\tau_t)$  for fixed  $\tau_t$  and then subsequently average over  $\tau_t$ . Since  $v(\tau)$  is a periodic function of  $\tau$  we have that  $\langle \delta(v(\tau_t)) - v \rangle v_0/v$  is periodic too with a period of  $\ln(2)$ . A Fourier expansion of this function gives

$$\left\langle \delta(v(\tau)) - v \right\rangle \frac{v_0}{v} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k(v) e^{i\omega k \tau}, \quad (\text{S66})$$

where the Fourier components are given by

$$b_k(v) = \frac{v_0}{\ln(2)} \frac{1}{v} \int_x^{x+\ln(2)} \langle \delta(v(\tau)) - v \rangle e^{-i\omega k \tau} d\tau. \quad (\text{S67})$$

We apply the same definitions as during the derivation of the expected population coefficients. From equation (S43) it follows that for  $\tau \in (x, x + \ln(2))$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta(v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0)) - v) \\ &= \delta(2e^\tau - v) \mathbb{1}\{\tau \leq \ln(v_{b,n})\} + \delta(e^\tau - v) \mathbb{1}\{\tau > \ln(v_{b,n})\} \\ &= \frac{1}{v} \delta(\tau - \ln(v/2)) \mathbb{1}\{v/2 \leq v_{b,n}\} + \frac{1}{v} \delta(\tau - \ln(v)) \mathbb{1}\{v > v_{b,n}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S68})$$

We can now take the expectation over possible values of the birth size to find

$$\langle \delta(v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0)) - v) \rangle = \frac{1}{v} [\delta(\tau - \ln(v/2))(1 - F_{v_b}(v/2)) + \delta(\tau - \ln(v))F_{v_b}(v)], \quad (\text{S69})$$

where  $F_{v_b}(v)$  is the cumulative distribution function of the birth size  $v_b$ . Since the division size is just double the birth size in distribution, we have that  $F_{v_b}(v/2)$  is the cumulative distribution function of division size. We can now solve the size-dependent coefficients by shifting the integration region in equation (S67) and plugging in equation (S69) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(v) &= \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \frac{v_0}{v} e^{i\omega k \ln(v_0)} \int_y^{y+\ln(2)} \langle \delta(v(\tau + n \ln(2) - \ln(v_0)) - v) \rangle e^{-i\omega k \tau} d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \frac{v_0}{v^2} e^{-i\omega k \ln(v/v_0)} [(1 - F_{v_b}(v/2))\mathbb{1}\{\ln(v) \in (y + \ln(2), y + 2 \ln(2))\} + F_{v_b}(v)\mathbb{1}\{\ln(v) \in (y, y + \ln(2))\}] \\ &= e^{-i\omega k \ln(v/v_0)} b_0(v). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S70})$$

Thus, all the coefficients are just complex rotations of each other, with the zeroth coefficient given by

$$b_0(v) = \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \frac{v_0}{v^2} [(1 - F_{v_b}(v/2))\mathbb{1}\{\ln(v) \in (y + \ln(2), y + 2 \ln(2))\} + F_{v_b}(v)\mathbb{1}\{\ln(v) \in (y, y + \ln(2))\}]. \quad (\text{S71})$$

Recall that  $y$  was defined to be a real number such that  $\ln(v_b) \in (y + y + \ln(2))$ . In other words, all births happen on the interval  $(y + y + \ln(2))$  and all divisions happen on the separate interval  $(y + \ln(2) + y + 2 \ln(2))$ . Therefore, if the size considered lies in the birth region given by  $\ln(v) \in (y + y + \ln(2))$ , we have that  $F_{v_b}(v/2) = 0$ . Conversely if the size lies in the division region given by  $\ln(v) \in (y + \ln(2), y + 2 \ln(2))$  we have  $F_{v_b}(v) = 1$ . In either case, equation (S71) is equal to

$$b_0(v) = \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \frac{v_0}{v^2} [F_{v_b}(v) - F_{v_b}(v/2)]. \quad (\text{S72})$$

The higher order coefficients are now given by

$$b_k(v) = e^{-i\omega k \ln(v/v_0)} \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \frac{v_0}{v^2} [F_{v_b}(v) - F_{v_b}(v/2)]. \quad (\text{S73})$$

hence in analogy to the derivation of equation (S33), we find a time-dependent cell size distribution of

$$G(t, v) = \frac{1}{N(t)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k(v) \langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \rangle \quad (\text{S74})$$

*The cell size distribution when growth rate is Ornstein-Uhlenbeck*

Let us now again assume that  $\lambda_t$  is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.  $\tau_t$  is now Gaussian with its mean  $\langle \tau_t \rangle$  and variance  $\sigma_\tau^2$  given by Eqs. (S12) and (S14). We further evaluate (S74) as

$$G(t, v) = \frac{v_0}{N(t)} e^{\langle \tau_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\tau^2} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k(v) e^{i\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_\tau^2)} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_\tau^2}. \quad (\text{S75})$$

Combining this result with equations (S74) and (S34), we find the exact result

$$G(t, v) = G(v) \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2 \cos(\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_\tau^2) - \omega k \ln(v/v_0)) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_\tau^2}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2 \frac{|c_k|}{c_0} \cos(\omega k (\langle \tau_t \rangle + \sigma_\tau^2) + \text{Arg}(c_k)) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 k^2 \sigma_\tau^2}}, \quad (\text{S76})$$

where

$$G(v) = \frac{b_0(v)}{c_0} = \frac{2}{v^2 \langle 1/v_b \rangle} [F_{v_b}(v) - F_{v_b}(v/2)]. \quad (\text{S77})$$

It's clear that equation (S77) is the time-limit of equation (S76). If we again use the large time approximation of  $\sigma_{\tau_t}^2$  from equation (S35), we can rewrite equation (S76) as

$$G(t, v) = G(v) \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \cos(k\Omega t - \omega k \ln(v) + \zeta_k) e^{-k^2 q t}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k \cos(k\Omega t + \phi_k) e^{-k^2 q t}} \quad (\text{S78})$$

where  $\Omega$  and  $q$  were given by equation (S37),  $A_k$  and  $\phi_k$  by equation (S49) and (S50) respectively and where we introduce new constants

$$B_k = 2e^{-k^2 q \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta}}, \quad \zeta_k = \omega k \ln(v_0) - 2\omega k \frac{\sigma_{\lambda}^2}{\theta} \quad (\text{S79})$$

By taking a finite number of terms from the denominator and numerator in equation S76 or S78, one obtains great approximations for the population cell size distribution that becomes progressively better for larger  $t$ . These approximations are properly normalized.

### VIII. THE DECOUPLING HOLDS UNDER MUCH MORE GENERAL CONDITIONS

In this section we show that population growth rate  $\Lambda_{\infty}$  is independent cell division sizes and the population size distribution is independent of growth rate, even when  $\lambda_t$  is no longer an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and division is not symmetric.

*Cell division doesn't affect population growth rate*

Consider a cell with some initial growth rate  $\lambda_0$  and initial volume  $v_0$  whose volume,  $v(t)$ , at time  $t$  grows with

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = \lambda_t v(t), \quad (\text{S80})$$

where  $\lambda_t$  is a stationary stochastic process with a well-defined mean. If this cell never divides, the total volume of this cell will be given by  $v(t) = v_0 e^{\tau_t}$ , where  $\tau_t \equiv \int_0^t \lambda_t dt$ . The expected value of the total volume will be

$$\langle v(t) | \lambda_0 \rangle = v_0 \langle e^{\tau_t} | \lambda_0 \rangle. \quad (\text{S81})$$

**First**, we show that the expected value of the sum of the volumes of all cells at time  $t$  in a population starting from a single cell is the same as Eq. (S81) as though the first cell never divided. **Then**, we show that the asymptotic growth rate of the total volume of the cells in a population is equal to the growth rate of the number of cells, as long as cell divisions happen in a manner that leads to cell size regulation. This gives the population growth rate  $\Lambda_{\infty} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dt} \ln \langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle$  which is independent of the details of cell division.

Consider the scenario where at  $t = 0$ , our cell divides (possibly asymmetrically) into two daughter cells with initial volumes  $v_0^{(1)}$  and  $v_0^{(2)}$  such that  $v_0^{(1)} + v_0^{(2)} = v_0$ . We assume both daughter cells inherit their initial growth rates  $\lambda_0$  from their mother cell at the time of division. We denote the two daughter cells' growth rate trajectories  $\lambda_t^{(1)}$  by and  $\lambda_t^{(2)}$ , as well as their corresponding stochastic times by  $\tau_t^{(1)}$  and  $\tau_t^{(2)}$ . The total expected volume of these two daughter cells given their initial growth rate  $\lambda_0$  will be

$$V(t) = \left\langle v_0^{(1)} e^{\tau_t^{(1)}} + v_0^{(2)} e^{\tau_t^{(2)}} \middle| \lambda_0 \right\rangle = v_0^{(1)} \left\langle e^{\tau_t^{(1)}} \middle| \lambda_0 \right\rangle + v_0^{(2)} \left\langle e^{\tau_t^{(2)}} \middle| \lambda_0 \right\rangle. \quad (\text{S82})$$

Even though the two daughter cells have independent growth rate trajectories, they share the same distributions since they both start from the same initial value, hence  $\tau_t^{(1)}$  and  $\tau_t^{(2)}$  are equal in distribution. It follows that

$$V(t) = v_0^{(1)} \langle e^{\tau_t} | \lambda_0 \rangle + v_0^{(2)} \langle e^{\tau_t} | \lambda_0 \rangle = v_0 \langle e^{\tau_t} | \lambda_0 \rangle. \quad (\text{S83})$$

Note that this is the same as the expected value of the total volume of the mother cell if it had not divided at  $t = 0$ , described in Eq. (S81). By induction, any subsequent division of each daughter cell also does not affect the expected total volume of the cells.

Next, we require that the average volume of cells within a population reaches some steady state, which should be true for any realistic cell division process. We thus say that  $\langle v(t) \rangle_p = V(t)/N(t)$  goes to some constant for large  $t$ . We now see that for large  $t$ ,

$$\Lambda_\infty = \frac{d}{dt} \ln N(t) = \frac{d}{dt} [\ln V(t) - \ln \langle v(t) \rangle_p] = \frac{d}{dt} \ln \langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle, \quad (\text{S84})$$

from which it is evident that the population growth rate only depends on the single-cell growth rate process.

*Growth rate variability doesn't affect the asymptotic population cell size distribution*

Recall that Eq. (S74) is valid for general growth processes. We can write it as

$$G(t, v) = \frac{\sum_k b_k(v) \langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \rangle}{\sum_k c_k \langle e^{(1+i\omega k)\tau_t} \rangle} = \frac{b_0(v) + \sum_{k \geq 1} 2|b_k(v)| \langle \cos(\omega k \tau_t + \zeta_k) e^{\tau_t} \rangle / \langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle}{c_0 + \sum_{k \geq 1} 2|c_k| \langle \cos(\omega k \tau_t + \phi_k) e^{\tau_t} \rangle / \langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle} \quad (\text{S85})$$

where the coefficients  $c_k$  and  $b_k(v)$  are given by Eqs. (S39) and (S67), and  $\zeta_k$  and  $\phi_k$  are phase shifts that depend on the complex angles of  $b_k(v)$  and  $c_k$ . To prove that  $G(t, v)$  converges to the asymptotic size distribution  $G(t, v) = b_0(v)/c_0$  given in Eq. (S77), it suffices to show that all higher order corrections of the form  $\langle \cos(\omega k \tau_t + \phi) e^{\tau_t} \rangle / \langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle$  go to zero as  $t$  goes to infinity for all values of  $k \neq 0$ .

Suppose  $\lambda_t$  is sufficiently well behaved and recall that  $\tau_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s ds$ . By the generalized central limit theorems for integrals over continuous processes [49] we have that  $Z_t = (\tau_t - \langle \tau_t \rangle) / \sqrt{t}$  converges to a normal distribution. If we denote the probability distribution function of  $Z_t$  by  $f_{Z_t}$ , then we can write out

$$\frac{\langle \cos(\omega k \tau_t + \phi) e^{\tau_t} \rangle}{\langle e^{\tau_t} \rangle} = \frac{\int \cos(\omega k \sqrt{t} z + \omega k \langle \tau_t \rangle + \phi) e^{\sqrt{t} z} f_{Z_t}(z) dz}{\int e^{\sqrt{t} z} f_{Z_t}(z) dz}. \quad (\text{S86})$$

Note that the integrand in the numerator is the same as the integrand in the denominator, but multiplied by a cosine whose frequency goes to infinity as  $t$  goes to infinity. The numerator therefore goes to zero with respect to the denominator, assuming that the convergence of  $f_{Z_t}$  to a normal distribution is sufficiently well-behaved. As a consequence, all terms except for  $b_0(v)$  and  $c_0$  in Eq. (S85) go to zero, and we are left with the desired asymptotic size distribution given in Eq. (S77).

## IX. OUR MODEL DIFFERS FROM MODELS WITH CELL-DEPENDENT GROWTH RATE

In other literature [1, 3–5, 15, 25], cell growth rate is commonly defined the variable  $\kappa$  satisfying

$$v_d = v_b e^{\kappa(t_d - t_b)}, \quad (\text{S87})$$

where  $v_b$  and  $v_d$  are the sizes of birth and division of a cell and  $t_b$  and  $t_d$  are the times of birth and division respectively. Alternatively we can rewrite this as

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{t_d - t_b} \ln \left( \frac{v_d}{v_b} \right) = \frac{1}{t_d - t_b} (\tau_{t_d} - \tau_{t_b}) = \frac{1}{t_d - t_b} \int_{t_b}^{t_d} \lambda_s ds, \quad (\text{S88})$$

hence  $\kappa$  as defined in equation (S87) is also equal to the growth rate process time-averaged over the lifetime of a cell. Since the lifetime of a cell is tied to the growth rate process itself, the distribution of  $\kappa$  may differ a lot from that of the instantaneous growth rate  $\lambda_t$ . Most notably, their stochastic means are different. This may lead to some seemingly contradictory claims such as in Ref. [25], where it is said that in the absence of mother-daughter growth rate correlations, the population number growth rate decreases with growth rate variability. In contrast, our model predicts that population number growth rate always increases with growth rate variability, regardless of any growth rate correlations.

To resolve this, we will show how our models are related in a special limit of vanishing auto-correlations where we let  $\theta \gg \bar{\lambda}$  while fixing  $D := \sigma_\lambda^2/\theta$ . The stochastic time is now fully equivalent to a Brownian motion with drift, characterized by the parameters

$$\langle \tau_t \rangle = \bar{\lambda}t, \quad \sigma_{\tau_t}^2 = 2Dt. \quad (\text{S89})$$

We define the first hitting time of  $\tau_t$  reaching a fixed value  $\tau$  by

$$t_\tau = \inf\{t : \tau_t \geq \tau\} \quad (\text{S90})$$

The distribution density function of such a hitting is known as an inverse Gaussian distribution. It is given by

$$g_{t_\tau}(t) = \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{4\pi Dt^3}} e^{-\frac{(\bar{\lambda}t - \tau)^2}{4Dt}}, \quad (\text{S91})$$

for which we can find the following inverse moments

$$\left\langle \frac{\tau}{t_\tau} \right\rangle = \bar{\lambda} + \frac{2D}{\tau}, \quad \left\langle \frac{\tau^2}{t_\tau^2} \right\rangle = \bar{\lambda}^2 + \frac{6D\bar{\lambda}}{\tau} + \frac{12D^2}{\tau^2} \quad (\text{S92})$$

We define  $u = \ln(v_d/v_b)$  as the stochastic time needed for a cell to reach its division size. Since divisions are triggered by cells attaining certain sizes, the division times can be defined as hitting times of the stochastic time reaching the right size, hence

$$t_d - t_b = \inf\{t : v(t + \tau_b) \geq v_d\} = \inf\{t : \tau_{t_b+t} - \tau_{t_b} \geq u\} \sim t_u. \quad (\text{S93})$$

Due to size homeostasis we must have that  $\langle u \rangle = \ln(2)$ . We can now calculate mean of the cell-average growth rate from equation (S88), as

$$\bar{\kappa} = \left\langle \frac{u}{t_u} \right\rangle = \bar{\lambda} + \left\langle \frac{2D}{u} \right\rangle \approx \bar{\lambda} + \frac{2D}{\ln(2)} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\ln(2)^2} \right) \quad (\text{S94})$$

and its variance as

$$\sigma_\kappa^2 = \left\langle \frac{u^2}{t_u^2} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{u}{t_u} \right\rangle^2 = \left\langle \frac{2D\bar{\lambda}}{u} \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{12D^2}{u^2} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{2D}{u} \right\rangle^2 \approx \frac{2D\bar{\lambda}}{\ln(2)} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\ln(2)^2} \right) + \frac{8D^2}{\ln(2)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\ln(2)^2} \right) \quad (\text{S95})$$

A close look at equations (S94) and (S95) reveals a lot about the differences between the conclusions from our model and the discretely varying growth rate model from Ref. [25]. Most importantly in the limit of small growth rate variability  $D \ll \bar{\lambda}$ , we can express the population growth rate in terms of the per-cell growth rate parameters

$$\Lambda_\infty = \bar{\lambda} + D \approx \bar{\kappa} - \left( 1 - \frac{\ln(2)}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\ln(2)^2} \right) \right) \frac{\sigma_\kappa^2}{\bar{\kappa}}. \quad (\text{S96})$$

This formula is the exact same as the known result for the discretely varying growth rate model in the limit of vanishing mother-daughter growth rate correlations and no division size variability. Equation (S96) directly illustrates how their and our model lead to seemingly different conclusions about the benefits of growth rate variability; fixing the average instantaneous growth rate  $\bar{\lambda}$  while increasing its variability benefits the population growth rate  $\Lambda_\infty$  whereas fixing the average per-cell growth rate  $\bar{\kappa}$  while increasing its variability decreases the population growth rate  $\Lambda_\infty$ .

The size increase variability  $\sigma_u^2$  can be linked to the parameters from the model discussed in section I by noting that

$$u = \ln(2) - \alpha \ln(v_b/\bar{v}) + \eta_n, \quad (\text{S97})$$

from which we derive

$$\sigma_u^2 = \alpha^2 \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2 + \sigma_\eta^2 = 2\alpha \sigma_{\ln(v_b)}^2 = \frac{2}{2 - \alpha} \sigma_\eta^2, \quad (\text{S98})$$

thus the difference between  $\bar{\lambda}$  and  $\bar{\kappa}$  depends on the size additive noise  $\sigma_\eta^2$  and the cell size control parameter  $\alpha$ . the population growth rate  $\Lambda_\infty$  is therefore also affected by  $\sigma_\eta^2$  and  $\alpha$  when fixing  $\bar{\kappa}$ . This explains why the discretely



varying growth rate model does not exhibit a full decoupling of division size variability and cell size control from population growth rate [25]. This difference also acts as an example of why the equivalence between the models breaks down when mother-daughter cell correlations are introduced.

So far, the reasons we have given as to why the continuous and the discrete model are different is that the dependency of the population growth rate on the model's parameters are very different. For the continuous model, population growth always increases with cell growth rate variability and is independent of division size variability, whereas for the discrete model, population growth is either decreased or increased by growth rate variability, depending on the strength of the correlation. In the latter, population growth is weakly coupled to division size noise. These findings alone do not necessarily imply that the models are fundamentally different. For all we know, one can convert one model into another by a simple parameter transformation. This is however impossible in the case of finite growth rate correlations. In the discrete model, It is assumed that the growth rates  $\kappa_n$  form a Markov-chain along a lineage. That is, the dependency of the distribution  $\kappa_n$  on the lineage history is purely captured by the growth rate  $\kappa_{n-1}$  of its mother cell. In the continuous model, the growth rates  $\kappa_n$  defined as the cell-cycle averages of  $\lambda_t$  do not form a Markov-chain and will therefore always produce different behaviour from the discrete model.

To show that the sequence of  $\kappa_n$  does not form a Markov-chain, consider the following example. Suppose the growth rate of some cell's mother cell  $\kappa_{n-1}$  is known to be close to average but the grandmother cell's growth rate  $\kappa_{n-2}$  is known to be above average. This information about the grandmother cell implies that the expected initial instantaneous growth rate of the mother cell would have been above average. Since we knew its cell-cycle average growth rate  $\kappa_{n-1}$  turned out average, its expected growth rate at division would have had to be below average to make up for the large expected initial growth rate. This would bring down the expected growth rate  $\kappa_n$  of the daughter cell. What we have seen here is that, given  $\kappa_{n-1}$ , extra knowledge of  $\kappa_{n-2}$  affects the distribution of  $\kappa_n$ . If the growth rates were a Markov-Chain then once  $\kappa_{n-1}$  is known, extra knowledge of earlier generations  $\kappa_{n-2}$  would not have affected the distribution of  $\kappa_n$ .

#### *The time-dependent population behaviour compared to other literature*

In Ref.[19], the time-dependent behaviour of the discretely varying growth rate model is studied through simulations. Mother-daughter growth rate correlations are ignored, so their model is equivalent to our model in the limit of  $D = \sigma_\lambda^2/\theta \ll 1$ . We may relate our model parameters via equations (S94) and (S95). Ignoring cell division variability, the oscillation amplitude decay rate from equation (S37) written in terms of these alternative parameters is

$$q \approx \frac{2\pi^2}{\ln(2)} \frac{\sigma_\kappa^2}{\bar{\kappa}} \approx 28.5 \frac{\sigma_\kappa^2}{\bar{\kappa}}. \quad (\text{S99})$$

Which is in perfect agreement with their empirically inferred oscillation amplitude decay rate of  $q \approx 29\sigma_\kappa^2/\bar{\kappa}$ . The oscillations in population growth have been extensively studied for cell populations where generation times are independently drawn from some distribution [38–40]. In the small noise limit, these results also agree with Eq. (S99)