Evolution of Biological Complexity

Christoph Adam 1, Charles O fria^{?1} and Travis C.Collier^x

^yK ellogg Radiation Laboratory 106–38 and [?]Beckm an Institute 139–74 California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125

^xD ivision of O rganism ic B iology, E cology, and E volution, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095

In order to make a case for or against a trend in the evolution of complexity in biological evolution, complexity needs to be both rigorously de ned and measurable. A recent information-theoretic (but intuitively evident) de nition identi es genomic complexity with the amount of information a sequence stores about its environment. We investigate the evolution of genomic complexity in populations of digital organisms and monitor in detail the evolutionary transitions that increase complexity. We show that because natural selection forces genomes to behave as a natural \M axwell D em on", within a xed environment genomic complexity is forced to increase.

D arw inian evolution is a simple yet powerful process that requires only a population of reproducing organisms in which each o spring has the potential for a heritable variation from its parent. This principle governs evolution in the natural world, and has gracefully produced organisms of vast complexity. Still, whether or not complexity increases through evolution has become a contentious issue. G ould [1] for example argues that any recognizable trend can be explained by the \drunkard's walk" model, where \progress" is due simply to a xed boundary condition. M cShea [2] investigates trends in the evolution of certain types of structural and functional complexity, and nds som e evidence of a trend but nothing conclusive. In fact, he concludes that \Som ething m ay be increasing. But is it complexity?" Bennett [3], on the

 $^{^1{\}rm P}$ resent address: Center for M icrobial Ecology, M ichigan State University, Lansing, M I 48824

other hand, resolves the issue by at, de ning complexity as \that which increases when self-organizing systems organize them selves". Of course, in order to address this issue, complexity needs to be both de ned and measurable.

In this paper, we skirt the issue of structural and functional complexity by examining genomic complexity. It is tempting to believe that genomic complexity is mirrored in functional complexity and vice versa. Such an hypothesis how ever hinges upon both the aforem entioned am biguous de nition of complexity and the obvious di culty of matching genes with function. Several developm ents allow us to bring a new perspective to this old problem. On the one hand, genomic complexity can be de ned in a consistent information-theoretic manner (the \physical" complexity [4]), which appears to encom pass intuitive notions of com plexity used in the analysis of genom ic structure and organization [5]. On the other hand, it has been shown that evolution can be observed in an arti cialmedium [6, 8], providing a unique glim pse at universal aspects of the evolutionary process in a computational world. In this system, the symbolic sequences subject to evolution are com puter program s that have the ability to self-replicate via the execution of their own code. In this respect, they are computational analogs of catalytically active RNA sequences that serve as the tem plates of their own reproduction. In populations of such sequences that adapt to their world (inside of a computer's memory), noisy self-replication coupled with nite resources and an information-rich environment leads to a growth in sequence length as the digital organism s incorporate m ore and m ore inform ation about their environment into their genome [7]. These populations allow us to observe the growth of physical complexity explicitly, and also to distinguish distinct evolutionary pressures acting on the genom e and analyze them in a mathematical framework.

If an organism 's complexity is a relection of the physical complexity of its genome (as we assume here) the latter is of prime importance in evolutionary theory. Physical complexity, roughly speaking, relects the number of base pairs in a sequence that are functional. As is well known, equating genom ic complexity with genome length in base pairs gives rise to a conundrum (known as the C-value paradox) because large variations in genom ic complexity (in particular in eukaryotes) seem to bear little relation to the di erences in organism ic complexity [9]. The C-value paradox is partly resolved by recognizing that not allofD NA is functional; that there is a neutral fraction that can vary from species to species. If we were able to monitor the non-neutral fraction, it is likely that a signi cant increase in this fraction could be observed throughout at least the early course of evolution. For the later period, in particular the later Phanerozoic Era, it is unlikely that the growth in complexity of genomes is due solely to innovations in which genes with novel functions arise de novo. Indeed, most of the enzyme activity classes in m ammals, for example, are already present in prokaryotes [10]. Rather, gene duplication events leading to repetitive DNA and subsequent diversi cation [11] as well as the evolution of gene regulation patterns appears to be a more likely scenario for this stage. Still, we believe that the Maxwell D emon mechanism described below is at work during all phases of evolution and provides the driving force toward ever increasing complexity in the natural world.

Inform ation Theory and Complexity

Using information theory to understand evolution and the information content of the sequences it gives rise to is not a new undertaking. Unfortunately, many of the earlier attempts (e.g., Refs. [12, 13, 14]) confuse the picture more than clarifying it, often clouded by misguided notions of the concept of information [15]. An (at times amusing) attempt to make sense of these misunderstandings is Ref. [16].

Perhaps a key aspect of inform ation theory is that inform ation cannot exist in a vacuum, that is, inform ation is physical [17]. This statem ent im plies that inform ation must have an instantiation (be it ink on paper, bits in a computer's memory, or even the neurons in a brain). Furthermore, it also im plies that inform ation must be about something. Lines on a piece of paper, for example, are not inherently inform ation until it is discovered that they correspond to something, such as (in the case of a map) to the relative location of local streets and buildings. Consequently, any arrangement of symbols might be viewed as potential inform ation (also known as entropy in inform ation theory), but acquires the status of inform ation only when its correspondence, or correlation, to other physical objects is revealed.

In biological systems the instantiation of information is DNA, but what is this information about? To some extent, it is the blueprint of an organism and thus information about its own structure. More speci cally, it is a blueprint of how to build an organism that can best survive in its native environment, and pass on that information to its progeny. This view corresponds essentially to Dawkins' view of sel sh genes that \use" their environment (including the organism itself), for their own replication [18]. Thus, those parts of the genome that do correspond to something (the nonneutral fraction, that is) correspond in fact to the environm ent the genom e lives in. Deutsch [19] referred to this view as \Genes embody know ledge about their niches". This environm ent is extrem ely com plex itself, and consists of the ribosom es the messages are translated in, other chemicals and the abundance of nutrients inside and outside the cell, the environment of the organism proper (e.g., the oxygen abundance in the air as well as am bient tem peratures), among many others. An organism's DNA thus is not only a \book" about the organism, but is also a book about the environm ent it lives in including the species it co-evolves with. It is well-known that not all the symbols in an organism 's DNA correspond to som ething. These sections, som etim es referred to as \junk-DNA", usually consist of portions of the code that are unexpressed or untranslated (i.e., excised from the mRNA). M orem odern views concede that unexpressed and untranslated regions in the genome can have a multitude of uses, such as for example satellite DNA near the centrom ere, or the poly-C polym erase intron excised from Tetrahym ena rRNA. In the absence of a complete map of the function of each and every base pair in the genome, how can we then decide which stretch of code is \about som ething" (and thus contributes to the com plexity of the code) or else is entropy (i.e., random code without function)?

A true test for whether or not a sequence is inform ation uses the success (tness) of its bearer in its environment, which implies that a sequence's inform ation content is conditional on the environm ent it is to be interpreted within [4]. A coordingly, M ycoplasm a m ycoides for example (which causes pneum onia-like respiratory illnesses), has a complexity of som ew hat less than one million base pairs in our nasal passages, but close to zero com plexity m ost everywhere else, because it cannot survive in any other environment m eaning its genom e does not correspond to anything there. A genetic locus that codes for inform ation essential to an organism 's survival will be xed in an adapting population because all mutations of the locus result in the organism's inability to promulgate the tainted genome, whereas inconsequential (neutral) sites will be random ized by the constant mutational load. Exam ining an ensemble of sequences large enough to obtain statistically signi cant substitution probabilities would thus be su cient to separate information from entropy in genetic codes. The neutral sections that contribute only to the entropy turn out to be exceedingly in portant for evolution to proceed, as has been pointed out, for example, by M aynard Sm ith [20].

In Shannon's information theory [22], the quantity entropy (H) repre-

sents the expected number of bits required to specify the state of a physical object given a distribution of probabilities, that is, it measures how much inform ation can potentially be stored in it.

In a genome, for a site i that can take on four nucleotides with probabilities

$$fp_{c}$$
 (i); p_{G} (i); p_{A} (i); p_{T} (i)g ; (1)

the entropy of this site is

$$H_{i} = p_{j}(i) \log p_{j}(i) :$$
(2)

The maximal entropy per-site (if we agree to take our logarithms to base 4, i.e., the size of the alphabet) is 1, which occurs if all the probabilities are all equal to 1/4. If the entropy is measured in bits (take logarithms to base 2) the maximal entropy per site is two bits, which naturally is also the maximal amount of information that can be stored in a site, as entropy is just potential information. A site stores maximal information if, in DNA, it is perfectly conserved across an equilibrated ensemble. Then, we assign the probability p = 1 to one of the bases and zero to all others, rendering $H_i = 0$ for that site according to Eq. (2). The amount of information per site is thus (see, e.g., Ref. [23])

$$I(i) = H_{max} \quad H_{i}:$$
(3)

In the following, we measure the complexity of an organism's sequence by applying Eq. (3) to each site and summing over the sites. Thus, for an organism of 'base pairs the complexity is

$$C = \mathbf{Y} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X \\ H (i) : \end{array}$$

It should be clear that this value can only be an approximation to the true physical complexity of an organism's genome. In reality, sites are not independent and the probability to nd a certain base at one position may be conditional on the probability to nd another base at another position. Such correlations between sites are called epistatic and they can render the entropy per molecule signic cantly di erent from the sum of the per-site entropies [4].

This entropy perm olecule, which takes into account all epistatic correlations between sites, is de ned as

$$H = p(g \pm) \log p(g \pm)$$
(5)

and involves an average over the logarithm of the conditional probabilities $p(g \not\equiv)$ to nd genotype g given the current environment E. In every nite population, estimating $p(g \not\equiv)$ using the actual frequencies of the genotypes in the population (if those could be obtained) results in corrections to Eq. (5) larger than the quantity itself [24], rendering the estimate useless. Another avenue for estimating the entropy permolecule is the creation of mutational clones at several positions at the same time [25,8] to measure epistatic elects. The latter approach is feasible within experiments with simple ecosystems of digital organisms that we introduce in the following section, which reveal significant elects. The technical details of the complexity calculation including these elects are relegated to the Appendix.

D igital E volution

Experiments in evolution have traditionally been form idable due to evolution's gradual pace in the natural world. One successful method uses microscopic organisms with generational times on the order of hours, but even this approach has diculties; it is still impossible to perform measurements with high precision, and the time-scale to see signicant adaptation remains weeks, at best. Populations of E.coli introduced into new environments begin adaptation immediately, with signicant results apparent in a few weeks [26, 27]. Observable evolution in most organisms occurs on time scales of at least years.

To complement such an approach, we have developed a tool to study evolution in a computational medium | the A vida platform [6]. The A vida system hosts populations of self-replicating computer programs in a complex and noisy environment, within a computer's memory. The evolution of these \digital organisms" is limited in speed only by the computers used, with generations (for populations of the order 10^3 10⁴ program s) in a typical trial taking only a few seconds. D expite the apparent simplicity of the singleniche environment and the limited interactions between digital organisms, very rich dynamics can be observed in experiments with 3,600 organisms on a 60 G grid with toroidal boundary conditions (see M ethods). A s this population is quite small, we can assume that an equilibrium population will be dominated by organisms of a single species [28], whose members all have similar functionality and equivalent these (except for organisms that lost the capability to self-replicate due to mutation). In this world, a new species can obtain a signi cant abundance only if it has a competitive advantage (increased M althusian parameter) thanks to a bene cialmutation. W hile the system returns to equilibrium after the innovation, this new species will gradually exert dominance over the population, bringing the previouslydom inant species to extinction. This dynam ics of innovation and extinction can be monitored in detail and appears to mirror the dynam ics of E. coli in single-niche long-term evolution experiments [29].

The complexity of an adapted digital organism according to Eq. (4) can be obtained by m easuring substitution frequencies at each instruction across the population. Such a m easurem ent is easiest if genome esize is constrained to be constant as is done in the experiments reported below, though this constraint can be relaxed by implementing a suitable alignment procedure. In order to correctly assess the information content of the ensemble of sequences, we need to obtain the substitution probabilities p_i at each position, which go into the calculation of the per-site entropy Eq. (2). Care must be taken to wait su ciently long after an innovation, in order to give those sites within a new species that are variable a chance to diverge. Indeed, shortly after an innovation, previously 100% variable sites will appear xed by \hitchhiking" on the successful genotype, a phenom enon discussed further below.

We simplify the problem of obtaining substitution probabilities for each instruction by assuming that all mutations are either lethal, neutral, or positive, and furtherm ore assume that all non-lethal substitutions persist with equal probability. We then categorize every possible mutation directly by creating all single-mutation genomes and examining them independently in isolation. In that case Eq. (2) reduces to

$$H_{i} = \log_{28} (N)$$
; (6)

where N is the number of non-lethal substitutions (we count mutations that significantly reduce the these among the lethals). Note that the logarithm is taken with respect to the size of the alphabet.

This per-site entropy is used to illustrate the variability of loci in a genome, just before and after an evolutionary transition, in Fig.1.

P rogression of C om plexity Tracking the entropy of each site in the genom e allows us to docum ent the growth of complexity in an evolutionary



Figure 1: Typical A vida organism s, extracted at 2,991 (A) and 3,194 (B) generations respectively into an evolutionary experiment. Each site is colorcoded according to the entropy of that site (see color bar). Red sites are highly variable whereas blue sites are conserved. The organism s have been extracted just before and after a major evolutionary transition.

event. For example, it is possible to measure the di erence in complexity between the pair of genomes in Fig. 1, separated by only 203 generations and a powerful evolutionary transition. Comparing their entropy maps, we can immediately identify the sections of the genome that code for the new \gene" that emerged in the transition | the entropy at those sites has been drastically reduced, while the complexity increase across the transition (taking into account epistatic elects) turns out to be C = 6, as calculated in the Appendix.

We can extend this analysis by continually surveying the entropies of each site during the course of an experiment. Figure 2 does this for the experiment just discussed, but this time the substitution probabilities are obtained by sampling the actual population at each site. A number of features are apparent in this gure. First, the trend toward a \cooling" of the genome (i.e., to more conserved sites) is obvious. Second, evolutionary transitions can be identied by vertical darkened \bands", which arise because the genome instigating the transition replicates faster than its competitors



Figure 2: Progression of per-site entropy for all 100 sites throughout an A vida experiment, with time measured in $\productors M$ ethods). A generation corresponds to between 5 and 10 updates, depending on the gestation time of the organism.

thus driving them into extinction. As a consequence, even random sites that are $\hbar i c h$

Hitchhiking is documented clearly by plotting the sum of per-site entropies for the population (as an approximation for the entropy of the genome)

$$\begin{array}{c} X^{`} \\ H & H (i) \\ & & \\ i=1 \end{array}$$
(7)

across the transition in Figure 3A.By comparing this to the tness shown in Figure 3B, we can identify a sharp drop in entropy followed by a slower recovery for each adaptive event that the population undergoes. Offen, the population does not reach equilibrium (the state of maximum entropy given the current conditions) before the next transition occurs.

W hile this entropy is not a perfect approximation of the exact entropy per program Eq. (5), it reacts the disorder in the population as a function of time. This complexity estimate (4) is shown as a function of evolutionary time for this experiment in Figure 4. It increases monotonically except for the periods just after transitions, when the complexity estimate (after overshooting the equilibrium value) settles down according to thermodynamics' second law (see below). This overshooting of stable complexity is a result of



Figure 3: (A) Totalentropy per program as a function of evolutionary time. (B) Fitness of the most abundant genotype as a function of time. Evolutionary transitions are identified with short periods in which the entropy drops sharply, and these jumps. Vertical dashed lines indicate the moments at which the genomes in Fig. 1 A and B were dom inant.

the overestim ate of complexity during the transition due to the hitchhiking e ect mentioned earlier. Its e ect is also seen at the beginning of evolution, where the population is seeded with a single genom e with no variation present.

Such a typical evolutionary history documents that the physical complexity, measuring the amount of information coded in the sequence about its environment, indeed steadily increases. The circum stances under which this is assured to happen are discussed presently.

M axwell's Demon and the Law of Increasing Complexity



Figure 4: C on plexity as a function of time, calculated according to Eq. (4). Vertical dashed lines as in Fig. 3.

Let us consider an evolutionary transition like the one connecting the genomes in Figure 1 in more detail. In this transition, the entropy (cf. Fig. 3A) does not fully recover after its initial drop. The di erence between the equilibrium level before the transition and after is proportional to the inform ation acquired in the transition, roughly the number of sites that were frozen. This di erence would be equal to the acquired information if the m easured entropy Eq. (7) were equal to the exact one given by Eq. (5). For this particular situation, in which the sequence length is xed along with the environm ent, is it possible that the complexity decreases? The answer is that in a su ciently large population this cannot happen (in smaller populations, there is a nite probability of all organisms being mutated simultaneously, referred to as M uller's ratchet [30]), as a consequence of a simple application of the second law of them odynam ics. If we assume that a population is at equilibrium in a xed environment, each locus has achieved its highest entropy given all the other sites. Then, with genome length xed, the entropy can only stay constant or decrease, in plying that the complexity (being sequence length m inus entropy) can only increase. How is a drop in entropy commensurate with the second law? This answer is simple also: the second law holds only for equilibrium systems, while such a transition is decidedly not of the equilibrium type. In fact, each such transition is best described as a measurem ent, and evolution as a series of random measurem ents on the environment. Darwinian selection is a lter, allowing only informative m easurem ents (those increasing the ability for an organism to survive) to be

preserved. In other words, inform ation cannot be lost in such an event because a mutation corrupting the inform ation is purged due to the corrupted genom e's inferior tness (this holds strictly for asexual populations only). Conversely, a mutation that corrupts the inform ation cannot increase the tness, because if it did then the population was not at equilibrium in the rst place. As a consequence, only mutations that reduce the entropy are

kept while mutations that increase it are purged. Because the mutations can be viewed as measurements, this is the classical behavior of the Maxwell Demon.

W hat about changes in sequence length? In an unchanging environm ent, an increase or decrease in sequence length is always associated with an increase or decrease in the entropy, and such changes therefore always cancel from the physical complexity, as it is de ned as the di erence. Note, however, that while size-increasing events do not increase the organism 's physical com plexity, they are critical to continued evolution as they provide new space (blank tape") to record environm ental inform ation within the genom e, and thus to allow com plexity to m arch ever forward.

M ethods

For all work presented here, we use a single-niche environment in which resources are isotropically distributed and unlimited except for CPU time, the primary resource for this life-form. This limitation is in posed by constraining the average slice of CPU time executed by any genome per update to be a constant (here 30 instructions). Thus, per update a population of N genomes executes 30 N instructions. The unlimited resources are numbers that the programs can retrieve from the environment with the right genetic code. C on putations on these numbers allow the organisms to execute signi cantly larger slices of CPU time, at the expense of inferior ones (see [6, 8]).

A norm al A vida organism is a single genome (program) composed of a sequence of instructions that are processed as commands to the CPU of a virtual computer. In standard A vida experiments, an organism's genome has one of 28 possible instructions at each line. The set of instructions (alphabet) from which an organism draws its code is selected to avoid biasing evolution towards any particular type of program or environment. Still, evolutionary experiments, and on the elements of chance and history. To minimize these e ects, trials are repeated in order to gain statistical significance, another crucial advantage of experiments in arti cial evolution. In

the present experiments, we have chosen to keep sequence length xed at 100 instructions, by creating a self-replicating ancestor containing mostly non-sense code, from which all populations are spawned. Mutations appear during the copy process, which is awed with a probability of error per instruction copied of 0.01. Form ore details on A vida, see [31].

Conclusions

Trends in the evolution of com plexity are di cult to argue for or against if there is no agreement on how to measure complexity. We have proposed here to identify the complexity of genomes by the amount of information they encode about the world in which they have evolved, a quantity known as physical complexity that, while it can be measured only approximately, allows quantitative statements to be made about the evolution of genomic complexity. In particular, we show that in xed environments, for organisms whose these depends only on their own sequence information, physical complexity must always increase. That a genome's physical complexity must be re ected in the structural complexity of the organism that harbors it seems to us inevitable, as the purpose of a physically complex genome is complex information processing, which can only be achieved by the computer which it (the genome) creates.

That the mechanism of the M axwell D em on lies at the heart of the com – plexity of living forms today is rendered even m ore plausible by the m any circum stances which m ay cause it to fail. First, sim ple environments spawn only simple genomes. Second, changing environments can cause a drop in physical complexity, with a commensurate loss in (computational) function of the organism, as now meaningless genes are shed. Third, sexual reproduction can lead to an accumulation of deleterious mutations (strictly forbidden in asexual populations) that can also render the D em on powerless. All such exceptions are observed in nature.

Notwithstanding these vagaries, we are able to observe the Demon's operation directly in the digital world, giving rise to complex genomes that, though poor compared to their biochemical brethren, still stupefy us with their intricacy and an uncanny amalgam of elegant solutions and clum sy remnants of historical contingency. It is in no small measure an awe before these complex programs, direct descendants of the simplest self-replicators we ourselves wrote, that leads us to assert that even in this view of life, spawned by and in our digital age, there is grandeur. We thank A.Barr and R.E.Lenski for discussions. Access to a Beowulf system was provided by the Center for Advanced Computation Research at the California Institute of Technology. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation.

Appendix: Epistasis and Complexity

Estimating the complexity according to Eq. (4) is somewhat limited in scope, even though it may be the only practical means for actual biological genomes for which substitution frequencies are known (such as, for example, ensembles of tRNA sequences [4]). For digital organisms, this estimate can be sharpened by testing all possible single and double mutants of the wild-type for tness, and sampling the n-mutants to obtain the fraction of neutral mutants at mutational distance n, w (n). In this manner, an ensemble of mutants is created for a single wild-type resulting in a much more accurate estimate of its information content. As this procedure involves an evaluation of tness, it is easiest for organisms who are not \epistatically linked" to other organisms in the population. Note that this is precisely the limit in which F isher's Theorem guarantees an increase in complexity [32].

For an organism of length `with instructions taken from an alphabet of size D, let w (1) be the number of neutral one-point mutants N (1) divided by the total number of possible one-point mutations

$$w(1) = \frac{N(1)}{D}$$
; (8)

Note that N (1) includes the wild-type 'times, for each site is replaced (in the generation of mutants) by each of the D instructions. Consequently, the worst w (1) is equal to D⁻¹. In the literature, w (n) usually refers to the average tness (normalized to the wild-type) of n-mutants. W hile this can be obtained here in principle, for the purposes of our information-theoretic estimate we assume that all non-neutral mutants are non-viable [33]. We have found that for digital organisms the average n-mutant tness closely m incors the function w (n) investigated here.

O ther values of w (n) are obtained accordingly. W e de ne

$$w(2) = \frac{N(2)}{D^{2}(1-1)=2};$$
(9)

where N (2) is the number of neutral double m utants, including the wild-type and all neutral single m utations included in N (1), and so forth.

For the genome before the transition (pictured on the left in Fig.1) we can collect N (n) as well as N_+ (n) (the number of mutants that result in increased tness) to construct w (n). In Tab. 1, we list the fraction of neutral and positive n mutants of the wild-type, as well as the number of neutral or positive found and the total number of mutants tried.

Note that we have sampled the mutant distribution up to n = 8 (where we tried 10^9 genotypes), in order to gain statistical signi cance. The function is well t by a two-parameter ansatz

$$w(n) = D^{n}$$
(10)

introduced earlier [8], where 1 measures the degree of neutrality in the code (0 < < 1), and rejects the degree of epistasis (> 1 for synergistic deleterious mutations, < 1 for antagonistic ones). Using this function, the complexity of the wild-type can be estimated as follows.

From the information-theoretic considerations in the main text, the information about the environment stored in a sequence is

$$C = H_{max} \quad H = ` H ; \qquad (11)$$

where H is the entropy of the wild-type given its environment. We have previously approximated it by summing the per-site entropies of the sequence, thus ignoring correlations between the sites. Using w (n), a multi-site entropy can be de ned as

$$H_{s} = \log_{D} w(')D'; \qquad (12)$$

re ecting the average entropy of a sequence of length '. As D ' is the total number of di erent sequences of length ', w (')D ' is the number of neutral sequences, in other words all those sequences that carry the same inform ation as the wild-type. The \coarse-grained" entropy is just the logarithm of that number. Eq. (12) thus represents the entropy of a population based on one wild-type in perfect equilibrium in an in nite population. It should approximate the exact result Eq. (5) if all neutral mutants have the same tness and therefore the same abundance in an in nite population.

Naturally, $H \cdot is$ in possible to obtain for reasonably sized genomes as the number of mutations to test in order to obtain w (') is of the order D \cdot . This

is precisely the reason why we chose to approxim ate the entropy in Eq. (4) in the rst place. However, it turns out that in most cases the constants and

describing w (n) can be estimated from the rst few n. The complexity of the wild-type, using the '-m utant entropy (12) can be de ned as

$$C_{\prime} = {}^{\prime} H_{\prime} : \qquad (13)$$

Using (10), we nd

$$C_{,} = ';$$
 (14)

and naturally, for the complexity based on single mutations only (completely ignoring epistatic interactions)

$$C_1 =$$
 (15)

Table 1: Fraction of mutations that were neutral (rst colum n), or positive (second colum n); total number of neutral or positive genom es found (fourth colum n), and total mutants exam ined (ffh colum n) as a function of the number of mutations n, for the dom inating genotype before the transition.

n	N (n)	N + (n)	Tot.	Tried
1	0.1418	0.034	492	2,700
2	0.0203	0.0119	225	10,000
3	0.0028	0.0028	100	32 , 039
4	4 : 6 10 ⁴	6 : 5 10 ⁴	100	181 , 507
5	5 : 7 10 ⁵	1 : 4 10 ⁴	100	13 10 ⁶
6	8 : 6 10 ⁶	2 : 9 10 ⁵	100	7310 ⁶
7	1310 ⁶	5 : 7 10 ⁶	100	5 : 1 10 ⁷
8	1 : 8 10 ⁷	1:1 10 ⁶	34	1 : 0 10 ⁹

Thus, obtaining and from a t to w (n) allows an estimate of the complexity of digital genomes including epistatic interactions. As an example, let us investigate the complexity increase across the transition treated earlier. Using both neutral and positive mutants to determ ine w (n), a t to the data in Table 1 using the functional form Eq. (10) yields = 0.988 (8) (is obtained exactly via w (1)). This in turn leads to a complexity estimate

C = 49:4. A fler the transition, we analyze the new wild-type again and nd = 0:986(8), not significantly different from before the transition (while we found = 0:996(9) during the transition).

The complexity estimate according to this t is $C_{2} = 55.0$, leading to a complexity increase during the transition of $C_{2} = 5.7$, or about 6 instructions. Conversely, if epistatic interactions are not taken into account, the same analysis would suggest $C_{1} = 6.4$, somewhat larger. The same analysis can be carried out taking into account neutralmutations only to calculate w (n), leading to $C_{2} = 3.0$ and $C_{1} = 5.4$.

References

- [1] Gould, S.J. (1996) FullHouse (Harmony Books, N.Y.).
- [2] M c Shea, D.W. (1996) Evolution 50, 477-492.
- [3] Bennett, C.H. (1995) Physica D 86, 268-273.
- [4] A dam i, C. & Cerf, N. J. (2000). Physica D 137, 62-69.
- [5] Britten, R.J. & Davidson, E.H. (1971) Quart. Rev. Biol. 46, 111–138.
- [6] A dam i, C. (1998) Introduction to Arti cial Life (Springer, New York).
- [7] Evolution in an information-poor landscape leads to selection for replication only, and shrinking genome size, as in the experiments of Spiegelman, see M ills, D. R., Peterson, R. L., and Spiegelman, S. (1967) Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 58, 217.
- [8] Lenski, R. E., Ofria, C., Collier, T. C., & Adami, C. (1999) Nature 400, 661–664.
- [9] Cavalier-Sm ith, T. (1985) in The Evolution of Genome Size, T. Cavalier-Sm ith, ed. (John W iley, New York).
- [10] Dixon M. & Webb, E.C. (1964) The Enzymes (A cadem ic Press, New York), 2nd. Ed.
- [11] Britten, R.J. & Davidson, E.H. (1969) Science 165, 349-357.

- [12] Schrodinger, E. (1945) W hat is Life? (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [13] Gatlin, L. L. (1972) Information Theory and the Living System (Columbia University Press, New York).
- [14] W iley, E.O.& Brooks, D.R. (1982) Syst. Zool. 32, 209–219.
- [15] In particular, Brillouin's book Brillouin, L. (1962) Science and Inform ation Theory (A cadem ic P ress, New York)] has done nothing but confuse a generation of researchers.
- [16] Collier, J. (1986) Biology and Philosophy 1, 5-24.
- [17] Landauer, R. (1991) Physics Today 44 (5), 23-29.
- [18] Dawkins, R. (1976) The Sel sh Gene (Oxford University Press).
- [19] Deutsch, D. (1997) The Fabric of Reality (The Penguin Press, New York), p. 179.
- [20] M aynard Sm ith, J. (1970) Nature 225, 563.
- [21] Ofria, C., Adami, C., & Collier, T.C. (1999). Selective pressures on genome size and neutrality in molecular evolution (submitted).
- [22] Shannon C.E.& W eaver, W. (1949) The M athem atical Theory of Comm unication (University of Illinois Press, Urbana).
- [23] Schneider T. D., Storm o, G. D., Gold, L., & Ehrenfeucht, A. (1986) J. Mol. Biol. 188, 415–431.
- [24] Basharin, G.P. (1959) Theory Prob. Appl. 4, 333-336.
- [25] Elena, S.F. & Lenski, R.E. (1997) Nature 390, 395-398.
- [26] Lenski, R.E. (1995) in Population Genetics of Bacteria, Society for General Microbiology, Symposium 52, eds. Baumberg, S., Young, J.P. W., Saunders, S.R., & Wellington, E.M.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge), pp. 193-215.
- [27] Lenski, R., Rose, M. R., Simpson, E. C., & Tadler, S. C. (1991) American Naturalist 138, 1315–1341.

- [28] For these asexual organisms, the species-concept is only loosely de ned as program s that di er in genotype but only marginally in function.
- [29] Elena S.F., V.S.Cooper, & Lenski, R.E. (1996) Nature 387, 703-705.
- [30] Muller, H J. (1964) Mut. Res. 1, 2-9.
- [31] Ofria, C., Brown, C.T., & Adami, C. (1998) in [6], pp. 297-350.
- [32] Maynard Smith, J. (1970) Studium Generale 23, 371-183, reprinted in J. Maynard Smith (1972) On Evolution (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh), p. 92.
- [33] As the number of positive mutants becomes important at higher n, in the analysis below we use in the determination of w (n) the fraction of neutralor positive mutants.