1 Skewed distributions of LRS: beyond 2 mean and variance

3 Shripad Tuljapurkar^{*1}, Wenyun Zuo¹, Tim Coulson², Carol
4 Horvitz³, and Jean-Michel Gaillard⁴

5 ¹Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA
6 94305-5020, USA

7 ²Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1
8 3SZ, UK

9 ³Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables,
10 FL 33124-0421 USA.

11 ⁴Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive, Université
12 Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR 5558, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France

*corresponding author: tulja@stanford.edu;

Abstract

Many field studies find that lifetime reproductive success (LRS) is highly skewed and often multimodal among individuals. Field biologists generate invaluable data on survival and reproductive rates, as a function of age and stage, that are used to parameterise structured models. These models often perform well at predicting population growth and mean LRS, but we do not know whether they accurately predict observed distributions of individual LRS. If the models fail to recreate these distributions, their use may be limited because the LRS is central to understanding life history evolution. We present powerful tools to generate distributions of LRS from age and/or stage structured models. Our methods reveal that structured models do perform well at generating distributions that agree with observations. Our approach also reveals why such skewed distributions arise, and helps resolve a debate about detecting signatures of selection in skewed distributions of LRS.

29 Introduction

30 Lifetime measures of reproductive performance describe the number of off-
 31 spring an individual produces over its lifespan (Clutton-Brock 1988). Many
 32 empirical biologists consider such lifetime measures as individual fitness (e.g.
 33 Kruuk et al. 1999; Brommer et al. 2004), although, with the exception of
 34 annual species (Fisher 1930), these measures are correlates of fitness (Grafen
 35 1988). Nonetheless, lifetime reproductive performance can provide gener-
 36 ational estimators of the opportunity for natural and sexual selection and
 37 phenotypic evolution. For instance, many empirical studies have assessed
 38 the opportunity for selection using the standardized variance (I metric, Crow
 39 1958) of reproductive performance and revealed high variation (e.g. in fe-
 40 males from 0.177 in lions, *Panthera leo* to 3.62 in elephant seals, *Mirounga*
 41 *angustirostris* (Cabana and Kramer 1991); and in males from 0.59 in Atlantic
 42 salmon *Salmo salar* to 4.52 in bighorn sheep, *Ovis canadensis*, (Tatarenkov
 43 et al. 2008)). Comparison of standardized variances of lifetime reproduc-
 44 tive performance between sexes within a population is commonly used for
 45 assessing the strength of sexual selection (e.g. Dubuc et al. (2014) on Rhe-
 46 sus macaques, *Macaca mulatta*). These empirical studies consistently reveal
 47 that distributions of lifetime reproductive performance measures are often
 48 non-normal, zero-inflated and highly skewed, and this begs the question:
 49 what are the demographic causes of these unusually-shaped distributions?

50 Lifetime Breeding Success (LBS) censuses offspring at birth (e.g. Slate et
 51 al. 2000), while Lifetime Reproductive Success (LRS) censuses them at some

52 later stage (e.g. weaning/fledging (van Noordwijk and van Schaik 1999),
 53 one year-old (Newton 1988), two years-old (Clutton-Brock 1988)). We ana-
 54 lyze discrete-time population models that are formulated in terms of species-
 55 appropriate modes of breeding and counting, but for simplicity use just the
 56 term LRS. So the question is: do such models predict LRS distributions that
 57 mimic those observed in nature, and why?

58 In the models here, individuals are distinguished by age and/or stage,
 59 and life cycles are described by probabilities of survival, stage transitions,
 60 and reproduction. Simulations for many species yield a distribution of LRS
 61 that is dramatically skewed or multimodal (Tuljapurkar et al. 2009b; Steiner
 62 and Tuljapurkar 2012), in accord with the empirical results mentioned above.
 63 Hence in any cohort, many individuals have an LRS of 0 so they leave no
 64 offspring; a lucky few have an LRS much higher than the average value. This
 65 variation is driven purely by chance since all the individuals are governed by
 66 the same probability rules (Steiner and Tuljapurkar 2012; van Daalen and
 67 Caswell 2017) (hereafter the latter reference is abbreviated vDC), meaning
 68 that “luck” can be more important than “pluck” (Snyder and Ellner 2018).

69 To quantify such “neutral” variation, Steiner and Tuljapurkar (2012) ob-
 70 tained formulas for the mean and variance (and higher moments) using a
 71 fixed fertility at every age/stage. But, as emphasized by vDC, offspring only
 72 come in integers (0, 1, 2, ...), so reproduction at every age/stage should
 73 properly be described by probabilities that an individual has 0, 1, 2, ... off-
 74 spring. Using the latter description, vDC derived formulas for the moments
 75 – mean, variance, and so on – of LRS for each birth stage (extending Caswell

(2011) and van Daalen and Caswell (2015)). The analyses by Snyder and Ellner (2018) also examined variance computed in this way as a measure of dispersion in the LRS. For populations structured only by age, the variance in LRS has previously been computed by Waples et al. (2011) and Charlesworth and Williamson (1975).

Yet, the moments do not provide the same information as the probability distribution of the LRS. Why? After all, the formulas in vDC easily yield the first three moments (also higher order moments but these don't reveal such interesting patterns as multimodality). For one thing, our intuitive understanding of these moments is often based on a roughly normal distribution and so can be of limited value. For another, a general approach to approximating a distribution by the first few moments, e.g., the Gram-Charlier expansion (Stuart et al. 1994), doesn't work for many (all the ones we've tried) LRS distributions, as we illustrate here. Thus the complete set of probabilities for LRS is often essential, certainly when the distribution is highly skewed or multimodal.

We present here a new method for computing the entire probability distribution of LRS for most species. We show below by examples that the distribution of LRS contains new and useful biological insights. Our methods highlight important questions: what factors determine the probability that individuals produce zero offspring during their lifetimes; how does a skewed LRS distribution affect natural selection, effective population size, and life history evolution? We discuss these questions, and point towards future work needed in this area.

100 The main text explains our method, and then focuses on examples. The
 101 first two examples are age-only models for human populations: the Hadza, a
 102 Tanzanian group of hunter-foragers, and a North American group called the
 103 Hutterites. The next example is a stage-only model for the large evergreen
 104 tree *Tsuga canadensis*. For these examples, the sources are cited in vDC,
 105 who also kindly provided matrices. The last example, and perhaps most
 106 general, is an age+stage model for Roe deer, *Capreolus capreolus*, based on
 107 the data in Plard et al. (2015). For each example we compute and display
 108 the full distribution, and also the first 3 moments (the same as in vDC).

109 Methods

110 Lifetime Reproductive Success (LRS) is a random quantity, and we find the
 111 probability for each possible value of LRS. We model demography in dis-
 112 crete time; vital rates may be structured only by age, only by stage, or by
 113 a combination of age and stage (age+stage). Mathematical details are in
 114 the online Appendix; we use and explain discrete convolutions and discrete
 115 Fourier transforms, unfamiliar to some biologists, but essential here. Code
 116 (based on R (R Core Team 2019) and the R package FFTW (Fastest Fourier
 117 Transform in the West) (Mersmann 2019)) is available from the authors. Our
 118 results should apply to continuous stages using established methods (Ellner
 119 et al. 2016; Snyder and Ellner 2018). Notation is always a nuisance; where
 120 possible, we use notation similar to Caswell (2011) and Caswell et al. (2018).

121 Our logic uses three points. First, every individual has a particular age

122 of death; second, at each age before death, there is a probability distribution
 123 for the number of offspring produced at that age; and third, convolution of
 124 these age-specific distributions (weighted appropriately by mortality) yields
 125 the distribution of LRS. We make the assumption that the probability dis-
 126 tribution at each age is independent of the distribution at all other ages.

127 **General Framework**

128 Age is counted in discrete intervals $a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$ and newborns are always
 129 in the first age interval (parameters are defined in Table 1). Stage is defined
 130 in discrete categories, $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$ (indexed as i or j) for stage-only and
 131 age+stage models. Stage transition probabilities (conditional on remaining
 132 alive) over a single time step are defined in a matrix $\mathbf{G}$ for stage-only models,
 133 or in a set of matrices $\mathbf{G}_a$ for age+stage models. One-period survival prob-
 134 abilities (from one interval of time to the next) are p_a for age-only models,
 135 $p(j)$ for stage-only models and $p_a(j)$ for age+stage models (Table 1). Mul-
 136 tiplying stage transitions by stage survivals, we obtain an $S \times S$ matrix of
 137 unconditional stage transition probabilities, $\mathbf{U}$ for stage-only models and a
 138 set $\mathbf{U}_a$ for age+stage models (Table 1).

139 Age-at-death is a random variable (well-defined even for populations
 140 where one-period survival depends only upon stage). The probability that
 141 an individual dies at each age a is the product of the probability of living
 142 to the beginning of age interval a with the conditional probability of dying
 143 during that age interval.

144 Reproduction for age-only and age+stage models is only possible between
 145 some specified youngest age α and an oldest age β , respectively. Stage-only
 146 models may have non-reproductive stages, but such stages may occur at any
 147 age. The number of offspring produced during a single time interval is a
 148 random variable that can take on integer values $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k_m$. The
 149 probability distribution of reproduction (in a single interval) depends on age
 150 (κ_a), stage (κ_j), or age+stage ($\kappa_{a,j}$), respectively for the age-only, stage-only
 151 and age+stage models (Table 1).

152 Finally, the number of offspring produced by individuals during a life-
 153 time, the LRS, is a random variable that can take on integer values $k =$
 154 $0, 1, 2, \dots, k_u$. The final goal of our analyses is always the probability distri-
 155 bution Γ whose elements are

$$\gamma(k) = \Pr[\text{LRS} = k]. \quad (1)$$

156 Our calculations assume that, within a single time interval, reproduction
 157 precedes death. Thus an individual alive at the beginning of a given time
 158 interval always reproduces according to its age and or stage at the beginning
 159 of the interval. Our formulas are easily changed to suit other assumptions.

160 The practical flow of decisions about which of the following methods to
 161 use is shown in the online Appendix (Fig. A.4).

162 Age-only Model

163 Here, survival and reproduction during a single time interval depend only
 164 upon the age of individuals. We want the probability distribution Γ of LRS
 165 (see equation (1)). The distribution of offspring κ_a at age a is taken to be
 166 binomial for age-structured human populations (so $k_m = 1$ and there are 0
 167 or 1 offspring at each age); but our method below applies to any form of
 168 probability distribution. We break life into segments: newborns (age 1) who
 169 die before reaching age 2, those who live to age 2 but die before 3, and so on.

170 First, consider individuals who die before reaching age $a = 2$. The prob-
 171 ability of such a death is $\phi_1 = l_1 [1 - p_1]$, and reproductive success at age 1
 172 follows the distribution κ_1 , so the LRS for such individuals has the proba-
 173 bility distribution

$$\gamma_1 = \phi_1 \kappa_1. \quad (2)$$

174 Next, consider individuals who reach age $a = 2$, reproduce and die before
 175 age $a = 3$. Such individuals have had two opportunities to reproduce. If
 176 these individuals have LRS = 2, they could have: i) produced 0 offspring
 177 at age 1 and 2 offspring at age 2, or ii) produced 1 offspring at age 1 and
 178 1 offspring at age 2, or iii) produced 2 offspring at age 1 and 0 offspring at
 179 age 2. In other words, at ages (1, 2), they could have (2, 0), (1, 1) or (0, 2)
 180 offspring. Hence the probability of LRS = 2 is

$$\kappa_1(2)\kappa_2(0) + \kappa_1(1)\kappa_2(1) + \kappa_1(0)\kappa_2(2).$$

Each LRS = k is analyzed in this way, and the corresponding probabilities
are elements of the discrete convolution

$$\delta = \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2. \quad (3)$$

For more detail on convolutions, see the online Appendix (Table A.1 and
section A.1). There are $(2k_m + 1) = 3$ possible outcomes resulting from this
convolution. Since the proportion of a cohort that dies at age 2 is ϕ_2 , the LRS
for individuals in a cohort who die before reaching age $a = 3$ is distributed
according to the probabilities

$$\gamma_2 = \phi_2 \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2. \quad (4)$$

In general then, an individual who lives to age $2 \leq a < \beta$ but dies before
reaching $a + 1$, has LRS distributed as

$$\gamma_a = \phi_a \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2 \cdots \star \kappa_a. \quad (5)$$

Reproduction ends after age β , so survival to later ages does not change
the LRS. Consequently, for an individual who lives to age $a \geq \beta$, the LRS
has distribution

$$\gamma_\beta = l_\beta \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2 \cdots \star \kappa_\beta. \quad (6)$$

Adding, we have

$$\Gamma = \sum_{a=1}^{a=\beta} \gamma_a. \quad (7)$$

194 Stage-only Model

195 For many species, stage (such as size or developmental stage) is predictive
196 of vital rates rather than age (Lefkovitch 1965). Survival, stage-transition,
197 and reproduction during a single time interval depend only on the stage s of
198 individuals at the beginning of that interval.

199 The number of offspring (k) produced during a time interval depends only
200 on stage j at the beginning of the time interval and is specified by probability
201 distributions $\kappa_j = \{\kappa_j(k)\}$ of producing $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ offspring (Table 1).
202 These distributions are often taken to be Poisson (e.g., some cases studied
203 in vDC), but that is not a requirement of our analysis.

204 Stage-structure requires multiple convolutions that make the age-only
205 procedure computationally unwieldy. This is because here, in contrast to
206 an age-structured model, individuals may visit a stage any number of times
207 before dying. They may also move back and forth between non-reproductive
208 and reproductive stages. So we need a fast way of (a) doing repeated convo-
209 lutions, and (b) summing over repeated convolutions.

210 To solve (a) we use the mathematical fact that the (discrete) Fourier
211 transform of a (discrete) convolution is the product of Fourier transforms,
212 and the numerical fact that the FFTW package (Mersmann 2019) does a fast
213 discrete Fourier transform. To solve (b), we exploit our earlier work (Steiner
214 and Tuljapurkar 2012) and combine a closed-form generating function with
215 Fourier transforms, then use an inverse FFT. For the details (or if this brief
216 description makes you curious) see the online Appendix (section A.5).

217 Thus we can compute the exact distribution of LRS for any stage-structured
 218 model. We can separately, and quickly, compute the probability that the LRS
 219 = 0. Both analyses are given in the online Appendix (sections A.5 and A.8).

220 **Age+Stage Model**

221 Here survival, stage transitions and reproduction during a single time interval
 222 depend on both age and stage (e.g. Coulson (2012), Table 1 and the online
 223 Appendix). In principle, here we can proceed as with the age-structured
 224 model. But the computation depends on the “size” of the life cycle, and
 225 determines a choice between two options. If all individuals reach a terminal
 226 age and die, and if the number of stages is modest, use the age-structured
 227 approach. If there are many ages and/or stages, and/or if all individuals reach
 228 an “old” age with stages in which they reproduce and remain until death,
 229 the age-structured approach is too slow. In that case, use a general stage-
 230 structured approach with block matrices (see online Appendix section A.6
 231 for details).

232 **Results**

233 **Age-Only Model: Two examples**

We contrast the Hadza, a hunter-forager group thought to be representative of early humans, to the Hutterites who in the 1950s were famous for their high fertility (vDC). We consider only females with no migration. One-

period survival probabilities by age, p_a , yield survivorship l_a (the probability of surviving until age a). Reproduction ceases at menopause $\beta \approx 50$ yr, so we do not need later ages. The commonly used fertility rate f_a is the mean number of offspring at each age. Fertility at age a can be 0 or 1 for human populations (vDC), with

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_a(0) &= \Pr[0 \text{ offspring} | \text{parent age } a] = (1 - f_a), \\ \kappa_a(1) &= \Pr[1 \text{ offspring} | \text{parent age } a] = f_a.\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

234 For each age, these numbers constitute a distribution we denote κ_a . We
235 ignore twinning, which is rare in these populations (but can be included by
236 adding the value of $\kappa_a(2)$). For other species (e.g., if there are litters with
237 many offspring) we need additional information to create a distribution of
238 offspring at each age.

239 We used our methods to compute the exact distributions of lifetime re-
240 productive success (LRS), Hadza in Fig. 1(a), Hutterites in Fig. 1(b); the
241 distribution is given by the solid points in the figure. Notable features:

242 (1) The distribution for the Hadza is dramatically bimodal, with a very
243 high mode at 0 and another at $\text{LRS} \approx 6$. These modes are very different
244 from the mean LRS of 3.13; the spread in LRS is not described by the
245 standard deviation ($= 3.36$). The third central moment ($= 21.7$) does
246 imply the distribution is skewed.

247 (2) The Hutterites have a low mode at 0 but a high mode at LRS close to

the mean of 7.53. Excluding the mode at 0, the distribution appears to concentrate nicely around the mean value, with a standard deviation ($= 2.93$) that captures the spread of nonzero values. However the third central moment is negative ($= -14.49$), presumably because of the mode at 0. If we didn't have the full distribution on view, this value of the third moment would be hard to understand.

Mode at $LRS = 0$

Is this likely to be a common feature? A female may have 0 offspring if she dies before reproduction begins, or lives on but has 0 offspring at every age. For the Hadza and the Hutterite, reproduction can begin at age 13 yrs. The probabilities of dying by that age are 0.415 for Hadza, 0.043 for Hutterites. The probability of living on but childless is 0.035 for the Hadza and only 0.008 for the high-fertility Hutterites. So the mode at $LRS = 0$ is largely determined by high infant mortality in the Hadza and the much lower infant mortality among Hutterites. Thus in general we should see a mode at $LRS = 0$ unless early mortality is extremely low.

Do 3 moments predict the distribution?

We can compute the LRS distribution from our methods, but can we recover a reasonable approximation from just the first 3 moments? For the Hadza, the answer is emphatically no, as shown by the Gram-Charlier approximation in Fig. 1(a) (the dotted line). For the Hutterites, the approximation works rather well for nonzero LRS but entirely misses the mode at 0, as shown in

Fig. 1(b) (the dotted line); so the answer is still no. We’ve tried a different method, starting with a Poisson and then using a numerical search for the “best” modification, but the answer is still negative. We have not tried using higher moments, because they do not seem likely to change our results.

Stage-Only Model

An example: An evergreen tree *Tsuga canadensis*

We use a stage-only model for *Tsuga canadensis*, eastern hemlock, an evergreen tree that grows to be 40-75 feet tall in the wild (as cited in vDC). Populations of this tree, as noted by Lamar and McGraw (2005), usually include many saplings, small individuals that may remain in good condition beneath a canopy for hundreds of years. So individuals exhibit considerable stasis.

The LRS for *T. canadensis* has an extremely pronounced mode at 0, and the skew of the distribution is so dramatic that we had to plot the logarithms of the probabilities of LRS, as shown in Fig. 2. The average LRS is just 1.42, but the standard deviation of 37.57 is not useful as a measure of spread at either lower or higher values. The third moment is huge, $\approx 2.6 \times 10^6$, which certainly means great skew, but does not predict the actual distribution in the figure. We expect a similar skewed distribution for many species (including plants and marine organisms) that produce large numbers of offspring such as seeds or larvae, but few recruits, and even fewer adults. The skew seen in Fig. 2 is relevant to current paradigms about life history evolution and

292 selection, as discussed in the final section.

293 **Mode at $LRS = 0$**

294 Individuals may produce 0 offspring even when they are potentially repro-
295 ductive, so our analysis identifies two related but distinct probabilities:

- 296 (i) One is $\Pr[LRS = 0]$, which is a high 0.9883 for *T. canadensis*! This
297 number is the sum of the probability of surviving while in non-reproductive
298 stages plus the probability of producing 0 offspring while in reproduc-
299 tive stages. We can always compute this probability exactly (see online
300 Appendix section A.8).
- 301 (ii) So does it always make sense to ask (as in the age-structured case) for
302 the conditional probability

$$\Pr[LRS = 0 \mid \text{die without reaching a stage capable of reproduction}]?$$

303 The answer depends on the life cycle. Suppose we start in a non-
304 reproductive stage. In one type of life cycle, every individual that sur-
305 vives eventually makes an irreversible transition to one or more stages
306 that are capable of reproducing (we call these reproductive stages).
307 For this case, it makes sense to treat the reproductive stages as “ab-
308 sorbing,” so we can compute the corresponding absorption probability.
309 Then $[1 - \text{absorption probability}]$ is just the conditional probability
310 defined above (see online Appendix section A.8). The value of this con-

ditional probability is 0.9878 for *T. canadensis*; comparing this number with 0.9883, we see that most individuals who have an LRS of zero must die without ever having entered a stage that is capable of reproduction. But, in life cycles of stage-structured populations that are not as described above, this probability doesn't make sense. In the general stage-structured life cycle, individuals can make any number of transitions back and forth between non-reproductive and reproductive stages and death can occur at any point.

Age+Stage Model

An example: Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus*

In general, an individual is classified by both age $a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$ and stage $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$. We illustrate with an estimated age+stage model for Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus* (Plard et al. 2015). Age is in years, and size in 200 equal body mass intervals from 1 Kg to 40 Kg. There are 4 age groups; in each group, there is one set of transition and survival rates and reproduction probabilities (the age groups are yearlings, adults age 2-7 yr, adults age 8-11 yr, adults over age 11). Age advances in single years.

The “initial stage” is a combination of age (here, yearlings in age class 1) and size. For initial age $a = 1$ there are potentially 200 initial sizes. In practice, yearling sizes range from size class 40 to 100, but we analyze the full potential size range (see the online Appendix section A.10). Fig. 3 plots the LRS distribution for 3 different initial size classes, 1, 75, 200. The

333 distribution shifts from unimodal at $LRS = 0$ for the smallest yearlings, to
 334 unimodal at a nonzero LRS for the largest yearlings, and can be multimodal
 335 at intermediate sizes.

336 Very small offspring have a high mode at 0, and thus the highest prob-
 337 ability of leaving no offspring – no surprise. Neither the average LRS nor
 338 the standard deviation seem to be useful descriptors of the LRS distribu-
 339 tion for the smallest yearlings (plotted in the online Appendix Section A.10).
 340 Somewhat bigger yearlings (birth size class 70-84, see Fig. 3) have a bimodal
 341 distribution of LRS. Larger juveniles (size class 85 upward) have a single
 342 nonzero mode but still high odds of leaving 0 offspring. The nonzero mode
 343 shifts from an $LRS \approx 3$ (for size class 80) to an $LRS \approx 5$ (for size class
 344 200) with increasing yearling size, and the distribution of LRS concentrates
 345 towards the mode. Very large offspring have a high nonzero mode at LRS
 346 ≈ 5 , with a normal-like LRS distribution around the mode.

347 **Mode at $LRS = 0$**

348 The height of a mode at an LRS of 0 can be computed using a age+stage
 349 method described above (see online Appendix Section A.10). We found that
 350 $\Pr[LRS = 0]$ declines with increasing birth mass. This is expected, since in
 351 this population it pays to be born larger. However the gain from increasing
 352 birth weight is strikingly nonlinear, so that the advantage of being born 1
 353 Kg heavier is much greater for small than for large yearlings.

354 To dissect this effect, we analyzed yearling death probability and the
 355 probability of having no offspring if you live to later ages (see online Ap-

pendix). There is a drop in both as birth mass increases, but the gain in yearling survival reduces faster than the gain in later survival/reproduction.

Discussion

We have presented an analytical method that computes the probabilities of getting every possible LRS, $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. We illustrated our results for two human populations for age-structure, eastern hemlock for stage-structure, and Roe deer for age+stage structure. We found that the LRS distribution often has one mode at $\text{LRS} = 0$, and a second at nonzero LRS. For several of our examples, the mean, variance and third moment are poor descriptors of the LRS distribution. We hasten to add that these moments are useful descriptors if offspring (often censused as newborns or recruits) have high survival, probably uncommon in nature but common in modern human populations. Even in the latter case, though, we recommend using our methods to analyze the probability that $\text{LRS} = 0$. We find an even greater variability of the LRS than expected from previous work (Tuljapurkar et al. 2009b; Steiner and Tuljapurkar 2012; van Daalen and Caswell 2015; Snyder and Ellner 2018) and vDC. Here we discuss extensions and implications of our results, and directions for future work.

Descriptors and Sensitivity analyses

How best to describe the variability that we have found in the LRS? And given a descriptor, what are its sensitivities to vital rates? In ecology, sensi-

377 tivities determine how vital rates (or underlying parameters) affect the LRS
 378 distribution, whereas in evolution sensitivities capture selection pressures
 379 that depend on LRS Caswell et al. (2018). For future analytical work, note
 380 that our stage-structured analysis applies to any age+stage combinations.

381 One descriptor of the inequality of LRS is a Gini index (Weiner and Sol-
 382 brig 1984; Shkolnikov et al. 2003), which corresponds to the mean of absolute
 383 differences in individual LRS relative to the average LRS, and is bounded
 384 between 0 and 1. The Gini index is commonly used in economics and social
 385 science to quantify inequality, but less frequently in ecology and evolution.
 386 It has been used to assess variation in the distribution of reproductive suc-
 387 cess of parasites (Dobson 1986), in the mass and fecundity distributions of
 388 a cestode infesting pikes (Shostak and Dick 1987), in the strength of forest
 389 edge effects (Matlack 1994) and in size hierarchy studies of competitive pro-
 390 cesses in plants (Weiner and Solbrig 1984). It has also been recently used
 391 to describe the shape of mortality within a population (Archer et al. 2018)
 392 and to quantify species differences in the distribution of reproductive ages
 393 across vertebrates (Healy et al. 2019). We propose that it will be valuable in
 394 analyzing variation between sexes or across species in the LRS distribution.
 395 To compute the Gini index, find the cumulative distribution

$$\xi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^x \Pr[\text{LRS} = x] = \sum_{k=1}^x \Gamma(x)$$

396 and plot $\xi(x)$ versus values (x/k_U) of the LRS (remember k_U is the largest
 397 possible LRS). This is the Lorenz plot shown for our examples in the panels

of Fig.4. Equality means that every individual has the same odds of any LRS and is indicated by the dotted lines. The actual distributions are shown by the solid lines and indicates that a few individuals do most of the reproducing. The Gini index (shown on the plots as GI) is

$$GI = 2 \times \text{Area between the two curves shown}$$

Equality means that $GI = 0$ while complete inequality means that $GI = 1$. As we expect from Fig. 1, the Gini is much smaller for Hutteries than the Hadza. And the extreme inequality of LRS for *T. canadensis* is reflected in a very high Gini. Surprisingly (to us) the LRS for a fairly large Roe deer yearling (size class 100) is also quite unequal, with a Gini value halfway between Hazda and Hutterite.

A general approach to the sensitivity of inequality in LRS should be feasible using our results in conjunction with the methods in van Raalte and Caswell (2013) and Caswell et al. (2018). More generally, numerical perturbations can be used to examine changes in Γ produced by changes in vital rates, and we can compare distributions using, e.g., the Kullback-Leibler distance (Cover and Thomas 2012).

A useful measure highlighted by our examples is the probability of having no reproductive success:

$$\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0] = \Gamma(0)$$

416 A general expression and computational method for this probability is given
 417 in the online Appendix (section A.8). Derivatives of this probability with
 418 respect to these parameters should be computable using known approaches,
 419 e.g., Caswell et al. (2018) or Steiner et al. (2012).

420 Another useful measure is the nonzero modal value, call it k^* , of the LRS
 421 – if it exists. We found a nonzero mode in several examples, but there is
 422 no nonzero mode for the tree (*T. canadensis*). Assuming its existence, a
 423 nonzero mode means that

$$\Gamma(k^* - 1) < \Gamma(k^*) > \Gamma(k^* + 1)$$

424 This modal value may be more meaningful in some populations than the com-
 425 monly used average LRS. We can use our result to find k^* and the methods
 426 in Caswell et al. (2018) should be extendable to compute sensitivities.

427 **Implications**

428 In our age-structured applications each individual is governed by the same
 429 set of demographic rates (probabilities). In other words, all individuals have
 430 the same chances of surviving and reproducing at each age. Yet, the distri-
 431 bution of LRS is multimodal; this reveals how much individual heterogeneity
 432 can be generated by chance alone. This variation caused Steiner and Tul-
 433 japurkar (2012) to conclude that entirely neutral processes could generate the
 434 empirically-observed multimodal distributions of LRS so frequently reported.

435 In our stage and age+stage structured models individuals that start life

436 with different phenotypic trait values can have contrasting distributions of
 437 LRS. For each phenotype there is still a large amount of individual het-
 438 erogeneity in LRS similar to that observed for our age-only models, but for
 439 individuals with different phenotypes we will find differing LRS distributions.
 440 These differences will generate opportunities for selection. Whether such se-
 441 lection would result in evolution will depend upon whether there is a genetic
 442 basis for individuals entering the population with different phenotypes.

443 Stage- and age+stage structured models are powerful. They can be con-
 444 structed for stochastic, density-dependent, and frequency-dependent envi-
 445 ronments to predict population (Tuljapurkar 1990), life history (Tuljapurkar
 446 et al. 2009a; Caswell 2001), and evolutionary dynamics (Coulson et al. 2011,
 447 2017; Childs et al. 2016). A large number of ecological and evolutionarily im-
 448 portant statistics can be calculated from these models, with analysis of these
 449 models revealing how different values of these statistics arise. By extending
 450 the toolkit of structured models to predict entire distributions of LRS we
 451 open the door for a number of powerful, new analyses. For example, we can
 452 ask how different growth trajectories will impact distributions of LRS, we
 453 can gain insight into why weak associations between birth weight and LRS
 454 are so frequently observed, and the conditions when lifetime measures of re-
 455 production act as a good, or bad, surrogates of fitness. In addition, we could
 456 use our approach to generate distributions of other per-generation life-history
 457 statistics such as generation times, or future life expectancies at a given age.

458 Previous analyses of LRS distributions in vertebrates relied on the stan-
 459 dardized variance and have supported the existence of a link between mating

460 systems and sex differences in LRS distributions, with similar distributions
 461 in males and females of monogamous species and much more widespread and
 462 skewed distributions in males than in females in highly polygynous species
 463 (Andersson 1994). However, our findings demonstrate that only using the
 464 first few moments such as mean and variance does not capture important
 465 characteristics of an LRS distribution. More comprehensive metric such as
 466 the Gini index are much more appropriate and should be used in future
 467 comparisons of LRS distributions. Our approach should thus allow accu-
 468 rate comparisons among LRS distributions that are currently accumulating
 469 thanks to long-term individual-based monitoring of populations in a broad
 470 range of species across the tree of life. Moreover, in addition to sex and
 471 species, our approach provides a suitable way to assess how ecological fac-
 472 tors (e.g. environmental harshness), life history tactics (e.g. slow vs. fast life
 473 cycle, capital vs. income breeding), and population structure (e.g. in terms
 474 of age, size) influence LRS distributions within and among populations.

475 The ability of the discrete-time structured model to gain ecological, life
 476 history, and evolutionary understanding is remarkable, and with each year
 477 new uses for them are developed. Such utility is not surprising, as these
 478 models (Coulson et al. 2011) include the fundamental biological processes of
 479 development, inheritance (although not considered in the current paper), sur-
 480 vival and reproduction, and these processes can be specified to vary across
 481 individuals as a function of age, sex, phenotype, genotype (although not
 482 considered in the current paper) and environment. It is consequently unsur-
 483 prising that analysis of such models has generated so much understanding

484 in recent years. The methods we develop here open up opportunities for yet
485 more biological insight.

486 **Acknowledgements**

487 We thank Ni Lao, Hal Caswell, and Maarten Broekmann for useful comments.

$a = 1, \dots, \omega$	Age, discrete intervals. Newborns are in the first interval $a = 1$. ω is maximum age.
$s = 1, \dots, S$	Stage, discrete categories. S is the total number of stages.
$\mathbf{G}, 0 \leq \mathbf{G}(i, j) \leq 1, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S,$	Stage only transition matrix, probability individual in stage j will be in stage i in the next time interval, conditional on survival. $S \times S$ matrix, column stochastic.
$\mathbf{G}_a, 0 \leq \mathbf{G}_a(i, j) \leq 1, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S$	Age+stage transition matrix, individual age a in stage j will be age $a + 1$ in stage i , conditional on survival. $S \times S$ matrix, column stochastic.
$p_a, 0 \leq p_a \leq 1$	One-period survival (age only) from age a to age $a + 1$. $p_\omega = 0$.
$p(j), 0 \leq p(j) \leq 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, S$	One-period survival (stage only) from stage j to any other stage.
$p_a(j), 0 \leq p_a(j) \leq 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, S$	One-period survival (age+stage) from age a and stage j to the next time interval. $p_\omega(j) = 0$ for all j .
$l_a, 0 \leq l_a \leq 1$	Survivorship to age a , probability of being alive at age a for a. $l_1 = 1, l_2 = p_1 l_1, l_3 = p_2 l_2, \dots, l_{\omega+1} = 0$.
$\mathbf{L}_a, 0 \leq \mathbf{L}_a(i, j) \leq 1, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S, a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$	Survivorship to age a by stage, probability of being alive in stage i at age a for those born into stage j . $S \times S$ matrix, changes with age (see text).

$\phi_a, 0 \leq \phi_a \leq 1, a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega, \sum_a \phi_a = 1$	Probability of age at death, the proportion of a cohort that dies at each age a . $\phi_a = l_a (1 - p_a)$ for age-only model (for stage-only and age+stage models see text).
$\mathbf{U}, 0 \leq \mathbf{U}(i, j) \leq p(j), i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S, \mathbf{U}(i, j) = \mathbf{G}(i, j) p(j)$	Cohort projection matrix (stage only), probability an individual in stage j is alive in stage i at the next time interval. $S \times S$ matrix, does not change with age.
$\mathbf{U}_a, 0 \leq \mathbf{U}_a(i, j) \leq p_a(j), i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S, \mathbf{U}_a(i, j) = \mathbf{G}_a(i, j) p_a(j)$	Cohort projection matrix (age + stage), probability an individual age a in stage j is alive at age $a + 1$ in stage i . $S \times S$ matrix, may change with age.
κ_a	Vector of probabilities that an individual age a produces k offspring, $\kappa_a(k)$, where $0 \leq \kappa_a(k) \leq 1$, $\sum_k \kappa_a(k) = 1$, and $a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$.
κ_j	Vector of probabilities that an individual in stage j produces k offspring at a single time interval, $\kappa_j(k)$, where $0 \leq \kappa_j(k) \leq 1$, $\sum_k \kappa_j(k) = 1$, and $j = 1, 2, \dots, S$.
$\kappa_{a,j}$	Vector of probabilities an individual at age a and stage j produces k offspring, $\kappa_{a,j}(k)$, where $0 \leq \kappa_{a,j}(k) \leq 1$, $\sum_k \kappa_{a,j}(k) = 1$, and $a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$. For each a , an $k_m \times S$ matrix(each column is for a stage j).
$\Gamma(k), 0 \leq \Gamma(k) \leq 1, \sum_k \Gamma(k) = 1$	Probability an individual produces k offspring during its lifetime.

Γ	Vector of probabilities, $\Gamma(0), \Gamma(1), \Gamma(2), \dots, \Gamma(k_U)$. $k_U =$ maximum possible number of offspring.
$\gamma_a = \phi_a \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2 \star \kappa_3, \dots \star \kappa_a$	Vector of probabilities of LRS for individuals who live to age a for $a < \beta$.
$\gamma_\beta = l(\beta) \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2 \star \kappa_3, \dots \star \kappa_\beta$	Vector of probabilities of LRS for individuals who live to age β and beyond.
$\Gamma = \sum_{a=1}^{a=\beta} \gamma_a$	Vector of probabilities of LRS, from summing across contributions by each age, up to and including the last reproductive age. (same as Γ above)

Table 1: Definitions

Figure 1: The LRS distribution of Hadza (a) and Hutterites (b) [solid points], and a Gram-Charlier approximation based on the first three moments [dotted lines].

Figure 2: The LRS distribution of *Tsuga canadensis*, eastern hemlock.

Figure 3: The LRS distribution of yearlings of Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus* for different initial size classes of 1, 75 or 200.

Figure 4: The Lorenz plots for Hutterite, Hadza, *T. canadensis*, and Roe deer (with initial stage 100).

References

- Andersson, Malte B (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Archer, C. Ruth et al. (2018). “Diet has independent effects on the pace and shape of aging in *Drosophila melanogaster*”. In: *Biogerontology* 19.1, pp. 1–12. ISSN: 1573-6768. DOI: 10.1007/s10522-017-9729-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10522-017-9729-1>.
- Brommer, Jon E. et al. (2004). “Single-Generation Estimates of Individual Fitness as Proxies for Long-Term Genetic Contribution”. In: *The American Naturalist* 163.4, pp. 505–517. ISSN: 00030147, 15375323. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/382547>.
- Cabana, Gilbert and Donald L. Kramer (1991). “Random offspring Mortality and Variation in Parental Fitness”. In: *Evolution* 45.1, pp. 228–234. ISSN: 00143820, 15585646. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2409498>.
- Caswell, Hal (2001). *Matrix Population Models: Construction, Analysis, and Interpretation*. 2nd. Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, MA.
- (2011). “Beyond R0: demographic models for variability of lifetime reproductive output”. In: *PloS one* 6.6, e20809.
- Caswell, Hal et al. (2018). “Age× stage-classified demographic analysis: a comprehensive approach”. In: *Ecological monographs* 88.4, pp. 560–584.
- Charlesworth, Brian and John A Williamson (1975). “The probability of survival of a mutant gene in an age-structured population and implications for the evolution of life-histories”. In: *Genetics Research* 26.1, pp. 1–10.

- 511 Childs, Dylan Z., Ben C. Sheldon, and Mark Rees (2016). “The evolution of
512 labile traits in sex- and age-structured populations”. In: *Journal of Ani-
513 mal Ecology* 85.2, pp. 329–342. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.12483. eprint:
514 [https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.](https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1365-2656.12483)
515 [1111/1365-2656.12483](https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1365-2656.12483). URL: [https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.](https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1365-2656.12483)
516 [wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1365-2656.12483](https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1365-2656.12483).
- 517 Clutton-Brock, T.H. (ed.) (1988). *Reproductive success: studies of individual
518 variation in contrasting breeding systems*. Chicago: University of Chicago
519 press.
- 520 Coulson, Tim (2012). “Integral projections models, their construction and
521 use in posing hypotheses in ecology”. In: *Oikos* 121.9, pp. 1337–1350.
- 522 Coulson, Tim et al. (2011). “Modeling Effects of Environmental Change on
523 Wolf Population Dynamics, Trait Evolution, and Life History”. In: *Sci-
524 ence* 334.6060, pp. 1275–1278. ISSN: 0036-8075. DOI: 10.1126/science.
525 [1209441](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6060/1275.full.pdf). eprint: [https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6060/1275.full.pdf)
526 [6060/1275.full.pdf](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6060/1275.full.pdf). URL: [https://science.sciencemag.org/](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6060/1275)
527 [content/334/6060/1275](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6060/1275).
- 528 Coulson, Tim et al. (2017). “Modeling Adaptive and Nonadaptive Responses
529 of Populations to Environmental Change”. In: *The American Natural-
530 ist* 190.3. PMID: 28829647, pp. 313–336. DOI: 10.1086/692542. eprint:
531 <https://doi.org/10.1086/692542>. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1086/](https://doi.org/10.1086/692542)
532 [692542](https://doi.org/10.1086/692542).
- 533 Cover, Thomas M and Joy A Thomas (2012). *Elements of information theory*.
534 John Wiley & Sons.

- 535 Crow, J F (1958). “Some possibilities for measuring selection intensities in
536 man.” In: *Human biology; an international record of research* 30.1, pp. 1–
537 13.
- 538 Dobson, A. P. (1986). “Inequalities in the individual reproductive success of
539 parasites”. In: *Parasitology* 92.3, pp. 675–682. DOI: 10.1017/S0031182000065537.
- 540 Dubuc, Constance, William L. Allen, Dario Maestripieri, and James P. Higham
541 (2014). “Is male rhesus macaque red color ornamentation attractive to
542 females?” In: *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 68.7, pp. 1215–1224.
543 ISSN: 1432-0762. DOI: 10.1007/s00265-014-1732-9. URL: [https :
544 //doi.org/10.1007/s00265-014-1732-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-014-1732-9).
- 545 Ellner, Stephen, Dylan Childs, and Mark Rees (2016). *A practical guide to
546 the Integral Projection Model*. Springer.
- 547 Fisher, RA (1930). *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Oxford Univer-
548 sity Press.
- 549 Grafen, Alan (1988). “On the uses of data on lifetime reproductive success”.
550 In: *Reproductive success: studies of individual variation in contrasting
551 breeding systems*. Ed. by T. H. Clutton-Brock. Chicago: The University
552 of Chicago Press, pp. 454–471.
- 553 Healy, Kevin et al. (2019). “Beyond the fast-slow continuum in animal life-
554 histories”. In: *Nature Ecology and Evolution* In print.
- 555 Kruuk, L. E. B., T. H. CluttonBrock, K. E. Rose, and F. E. Guinness (1999).
556 “Early determinants of lifetime reproductive success differ between the
557 sexes in red deer”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series
558 B-Biological Sciences* 266.1429, pp. 1655–1661.

- 559 Lamar, W Robert and James B McGraw (2005). “Evaluating the use of
560 remotely sensed data in matrix population modeling for eastern hem-
561 lock (*Tsuga canadensis* L.)” In: *Forest Ecology and Management* 212.1-3,
562 pp. 50–64.
- 563 Lefkovitch, LP (1965). “The study of population growth in organisms grouped
564 by stages”. In: *Biometrics*, pp. 1–18.
- 565 Matlack, Glenn R. (1994). “Vegetation Dynamics of the Forest Edge – Trends
566 in Space and Successional Time”. In: *Journal of Ecology* 82.1, pp. 113–
567 123. ISSN: 00220477, 13652745. URL: [http://www.jstor.org/stable/](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2261391)
568 2261391.
- 569 Mersmann, Olaf (2019). *fftw: Fast FFT and DCT Based on the FFTW Li-*
570 *brary*. R package version 1.0-5. URL: [https://CRAN.R-project.org/](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fftw)
571 [package=fftw](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fftw).
- 572 Newton, I. (1988). “Age and reproduction in the Sparrowhawk”. In: *Re-*
573 *productive success: studies of individual variation in contrasting breeding*
574 *systems*. Ed. by T. H. Clutton-Brock. Chicago: The University of Chicago
575 Press, pp. 201–219.
- 576 Plard, Floriane et al. (2015). “Quantifying the influence of measured and
577 unmeasured individual differences on demography”. In: *Journal of Animal*
578 *Ecology* 84.5, pp. 1434–1445.
- 579 R Core Team (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Com-*
580 *puting*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL:
581 <https://www.R-project.org/>.

- 582 Shkolnikov, Vladimir M., Evgeny M. Andreev, and Alexander Begun (2003).
583 “Gini coefficient as a life table function: Computation from discrete data,
584 decomposition of differences and empirical examples”. In: *Demographic*
585 *Research* 8.11, pp. 305–358. DOI: 10.4054/DemRes.2003.8.11. eprint:
586 [https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol8/11/8-](https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol8/11/8-11.pdf)
587 [11.pdf](https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol8/11/8-11.pdf). URL: [https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/](https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol8/11/)
588 [vol8/11/](https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol8/11/).
- 589 Shostak, Allen W. and Terry A. Dick (1987). “Individual variability in re-
590 productive success of *Triaenophorus crassus* Forel (Cestoda: Pseudophyl-
591 lidea), with comments on use of the Lorenz curve and Gini coefficient”.
592 In: *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 65.12, pp. 2878–2885. DOI: 10.1139/
593 z87-437. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1139/z87-437>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1139/z87-437>.
- 594
595 Slate, J. et al. (2000). “Inbreeding Depression Influences Lifetime Breeding
596 Success in a Wild Population of Red Deer (*Cervus elaphus*)”. In: *Proceed-*
597 *ings: Biological Sciences* 267.1453, pp. 1657–1662. ISSN: 09628452. URL:
598 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2665912>.
- 599 Snyder, Robin and Stephen Ellner (2018). “Pluck or Luck: Does Trait Vari-
600 ation or Chance Drive Variation in Lifetime Reproductive Success?” In:
601 *The American Naturalist* 191.4, E90–E107.
- 602 Steiner, U.K. and S. Tuljapurkar (2012). “Neutral theory for life histories
603 and individual variability in fitness components”. In: *Proceedings of the*
604 *National Academy of Sciences* 109, pp. 4684–4689.

Steiner, U.K., S. Tuljapurkar, T. Coulson, and C. Horvitz (2012). “Trading
Stages: Life Expectancies in Structured Populations”. In: *Experimental
Gerontology*.

Stuart, Alan, J Keith Ord, and Sir Maurice Kendall (1994). *Distribution
theory*. Edward Arnold; New York.

Tatarenkov, Andrey, Christiane I. M. Healey, Gregory F. Grether, and John
C. Avise (2008). “Pronounced reproductive skew in a natural population
of green swordtails, *Xiphophorus helleri*”. In: *Molecular Ecology* 17.20,
pp. 4522–4534. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03936.x. eprint:
[https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-
294X.2008.03936.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03936.x). URL: [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/
abs/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03936.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03936.x).

Tuljapurkar, S. (1990). *Population dynamics in variable environments*. New
York: Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Tuljapurkar, S., JM Gaillard, and T. Coulson (2009a). “From stochastic envi-
ronments to life histories and back.” In: *Philosophical transactions of the
Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences* 364.1523, pp. 1499–
1509.

Tuljapurkar, S., U.K. Steiner, and S.H. Orzack (2009b). “Dynamic hetero-
geneity in life histories”. In: *Ecology Letters* 12.1, pp. 93–106.

van Daalen, Silke F. and Hal Caswell (2017). “Lifetime reproductive output:
individual stochasticity, variance, and sensitivity analysis”. In: *Theoretical
Ecology* 10.3, pp. 355–374.

- 628 Van Daalen, Silke and Hal Caswell (2015). “Lifetime reproduction and the
629 second demographic transition: Stochasticity and individual variation”.
630 In: *Demographic Research* 33, pp. 561–588.
- 631 Van Noordwijk, Maria A. and Carcl P. van Schaik (1999). “The effects
632 of dominance rank and group size on female lifetime reproductive suc-
633 cess in wild long-tailed macaques, *Macaca fascicularis*”. In: *Primates* 40.1,
634 pp. 105–130. ISSN: 1610-7365. DOI: 10.1007/BF02557705. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02557705>.
635
- 636 Van Raalte, Alyson A. and Hal Caswell (2013). “Perturbation Analysis of
637 Indices of Lifespan Variability”. In: *Demography* 50.5, pp. 1615–1640.
638 ISSN: 1533-7790. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-013-0223-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0223-3>.
639
- 640 Waples, Robin S, Chi Do, and Julien Chopelet (2011). “Calculating N_e and
641 N_e/N in age-structured populations: a hybrid Felsenstein-Hill approach”.
642 In: *Ecology* 92.7, pp. 1513–1522.
- 643 Weiner, Jacob and Otto T. Solbrig (1984). “The meaning and measurement
644 of size hierarchies in plant populations”. In: *Oecologia* 61.3, pp. 334–336.
645 ISSN: 1432-1939. DOI: 10.1007/BF00379630. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00379630>.
646

Appendix

Shripad Tuljapurkar^{*1}, Wenyun Zuo¹, Tim Coulson², Carol Horvitz³, and Jean-Michel Gaillard⁴

¹Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-5020, USA

²Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3SZ, UK

³Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124-0421 USA.

⁴Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive, Université Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR 5558, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France

A.1 Discrete Convolutions and Age structure

Consider an age-structured population with only two age classes. Say that an individual of age class 1 has some number of offspring $i_1 = 0, 1, \dots, k_m$ with probabilities $\kappa_1 = \{\kappa_1(i_1)\}$, and an individual of age class 2 has $i_2 = 0, 1, \dots, k_m$ offspring with probabilities $\kappa_2 = \{\kappa_2(i_2)\}$. Now consider an individual who may produce offspring at both ages 1 and 2, and call $\delta(n)$ the probability that such an individual produces n offspring, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k_m$. Given any n , some m_1 offspring are produced at age 1 and the rest, $k_2 = (n - m_1)$, must be produced at age 2. The number of ways to obtain a given n varies with n . For example, there is only one way to obtain $n = 0$ (both

^{*}corresponding author: tulja@stanford.edu

23 $m_1 = 0$ and $m_2 = 0$). Similarly, there is only one way for $n = 2k_m$ (both
24 $m_1 = k_m$ and $m_2 = k_m$). There are only two ways for $n = 1$ (either $m_1 = 1$
25 and $m_2 = 0$ or $m_1 = 0$ and $m_2 = 1$). In general, we sum over the probabilities
26 of the different ways we could get a particular n

$$\delta(n) = \sum \kappa_1(m_1) \kappa_2(n - m_1), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

27 where the number of terms in the summation varies from 1 to a maximum
28 of $k_m + 1$. The probabilities $\{\delta(n)\}$ are components of a distribution that we
29 write as δ . Also, the fact that the first argument in equation (A.1) is m_1 and
30 the second is $(n - m_1)$ means that δ is what is called a discrete convolution
31 of the distributions κ_1 and κ_2 , written as

$$\delta = \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

32 Alternatively we can describe κ_1 and κ_2 by the probability generating
33 functions

$$w_1(x) = \sum_{i_1} \kappa_1(i_1) x^{i_1}, \quad w_2(x) = \sum_{i_2} \kappa_2(i_2) x^{i_2}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

34 where x is a dummy variable. Let the probability generating function for δ
35 be

$$u(x) = \sum_n \delta(n) x^n. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

36 Setting

$$u(x) = w_1(x) w_2(x), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

37 also (algebra!) yields the probabilities in equation (A.1). Thus there is a
38 correspondence between convolutions of distributions as in equation (A.2))
39 and products of generating functions (as in equation (A.5)).

40 Using equation (A.3), we see that the distribution $\kappa_1 \star \kappa_1$ has a generating
41 function $[w_1(x)]^2$. As a result, we write $\kappa_1 \star \kappa_1$ as κ^2 . Also, $\kappa_1 \star \kappa_2 = \kappa_2 \star \kappa_1$.
42 Finally, note that convolutions can be rapidly computed (for discrete and
43 continuous functions).

44 For age structured populations, we can use repeated convolutions to com-
45 pute the LRS distribution as in the main text. But this method doesn't work
46 for stage structure so we need a different approach that starts with the prop-
47 erty discussed next.

A.2 Fourier transforms

Fourier transforms require complex numbers. Denote

$$\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For an integer N , define the frequencies

$$\theta(z) = \exp\left[\frac{-2\pi z \mathbf{i}}{N}\right], z = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then for any integer q , define the discrete function $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = \{\kappa(0), \kappa(1), \kappa(2), \dots, \kappa(q)\}$ (this could be a probability distribution). Then we define the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ as a function $\widehat{\kappa}$, whose values are given for each frequency in equation (A.7) as,

$$\widehat{\kappa}(\theta(z)) = \sum_{b=0}^q \kappa(b) \theta(z)^b. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Now suppose that $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is another series of numbers, $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \{\psi(0), \psi(1), \dots, \psi(q)\}$. For frequencies $\theta(z)$, we can use equation (A.8) to find the Fourier transform $\widehat{\psi}(\theta(z))$. It is well known that (James 2002)

the Fourier transform of $\{\boldsymbol{\kappa} \star \boldsymbol{\psi}\}$ is the product $\widehat{\kappa} \widehat{\psi}$

In consequence, for any frequency $\theta(z)$ in equation (A.7): for any integer $m \geq 0$,

$$\widehat{(\kappa^m)}(\theta(z)) = (\widehat{\kappa}(\theta(z)))^m, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and for any non-negative integers m_a, m_b

$$\widehat{(\kappa^{m_a} \star \psi^{m_b})}(\theta(z)) = \widehat{\kappa}(\theta(z))^{m_a} \widehat{\psi}(\theta(z))^{m_b}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

A.3 Digression: A Generating Function

We consider a general age+stage model following Steiner and Tuljapurkar (2012). Age and stage are used together: given A ages and S discrete stages, there are $(A \times S) = S_1$ unique combinations, so that we can proceed as if we had a stage-only model with S_1 stages. Let there be S_1 living stages, with transitions between them with probabilities $\mathbf{U}$ (Table 1 in main text). Form

the matrix $\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{Q}$. The element q_{ij} of matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ is the probability of being in stage i in one time interval and then surviving to reach stage j in the next time interval. The stages that are rows (or columns) of $\mathbf{Q}$ are transient, meaning that an individual starts in any stage then makes transitions to other stages until an eventual but certain death. Starting in a particular stage i let τ_j be the (random) time spent in stage j before death. (In the main text we use matrix $\mathbf{U}$, but here, we are using the transposed matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ and so reverse rows and columns).

The death probabilities for stages 1 to S are components d_i of a vector $\mathbf{d}$. These death rates are of course simply probabilities of not reaching another transient stage, so e.g.,

$$d_i = 1 - \sum_j q_{ij}.$$

We summarize by defining

$$\mathbf{e} = \text{a column vector whose every entry is 1,} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and writing $\mathbf{I}$ for the identity matrix, so that

$$\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{e}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Consider the possible outcome in which an individual spends a time m_j in stage j . In our notation, this outcome means that $\tau_j = m_j$, conditional on starting in stage i , and has probability,

$$P_i[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S] = \Pr[\tau_1 = m_1, \tau_2 = m_2, \dots, \tau_S = m_S | \text{starting stage } i]. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Let $w_i, i = 1, \dots, S$ be a set of (dummy) variables, and make a generating function for the above probabilities,

$$V_i = \sum_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S} P_i[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S] w_1^{m_1} w_2^{m_2} \dots w_S^{m_S}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Say we start in stage 1, so $i = 1$. Then $V_i = V_1$ is a polynomial, whose first term is $w_1 d_1$ – meaning an individual starts in 1 but dies before making a transition. The second term of V_1 is

$$w_1 q_{11} w_1 d_1 + w_1 q_{12} w_2 d_2 + \dots + w_1 q_{1S} w_S d_S,$$

meaning an individual starts in stage 1, lives one period and reaches some stage j , but then dies before making a second transition. And so on.

90 Following Steiner and Tuljapurkar (2012), form the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}\{w_i\}, i = 1, \dots, S. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

91 Define the vector function

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{d}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

92 where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix and $\mathbf{d}$ is defined in equation (A.12).

93 Let the components of $\mathbf{V}$ in equation (A.16) be $\{V_i, i = 1, \dots, S\}$. Then
 94 this component V_i is indeed the generating function defined earlier in equa-
 95 tion (A.14). The reader can derive this by expanding the inverse in equa-
 96 tion (A.16) and seeing, e.g., that the resulting polynomial V_1 has the same
 97 terms as we describe above.

98 A.4 To the LRS

99 We now combine convolutions, the generating function, and Fourier trans-
 100 forms.

101 Start by defining frequencies. Choose a number N that is the largest
 102 possible number of offspring. This may be approximated by a product like
 103 $k_U \leq (\omega \times k_m)$ with ω being an estimated maximum age, and k_m being
 104 the maximum number of offspring per time period. Or a biological upper
 105 limit can be used. Either way, we can test the adequacy of our choice by
 106 computing Γ and then its sum, which should be very close to 1.

107 Given N , for every stage i we pad each offspring probability distribution
 108 κ_i by adding zeros so that the padded distribution has N elements. For each
 109 frequency $\theta(z)$, as in equation (A.7), let the Fourier transforms of the padded
 110 distributions κ_i be $\hat{\kappa}_i$, so for example

$$\hat{\kappa}_i(\theta(z)) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \kappa_i(k) \theta(z)^k. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

111 For any non-reproducing stage i we have $\kappa_i = \{1, 0, \dots\}$, and so

$$\hat{\kappa}_i(\theta(z)) = 1, \text{ for all } \theta(z) \text{ for non-reproducing stages.} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

112 Now as in the previous subsection, say that, starting in stage i an indi-
 113 vidual spends time m_j in each stage j before death (for stages $j = 1, 2, \dots$).
 114 The total offspring numbers that result have the distribution

$$\kappa_1^{m_1} \star \kappa_2^{m_2} \star \dots \star \kappa_S^{m_S} = \delta. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

115 So in this case

Pr[number of offspring is k | starting stage i]

116 is given by the k th element of the convolution δ in equation (A.19)

117 The lifetime probability of having k offspring is the k th element $\gamma(k)$ of

$$\Gamma = \sum_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S} P[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S | \text{starting stage } i] \kappa_1^{m_1} \star \kappa_2^{m_2} \star \dots \star \kappa_S^{m_S}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

118 Here Γ can be thought of as a function of the discrete argument $k = 0, 1, \dots$
 119 with values $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots$. This is reminiscent of equation (A.14), but un-
 120 fortunately here we have convolutions and not products of numbers. This is
 121 where Fourier transforms come in.

122 We denote the Fourier transform of this function by $\widehat{\Gamma}$. Note that this
 123 latter transformed function is defined for each discrete frequency; so if the
 124 frequencies are $\theta(0), \theta(1), \dots$, the Fourier transform is the set of (scalar)
 125 values $\widehat{\Gamma}(\theta(0)), \widehat{\Gamma}(\theta(1)), \dots$.

126 Using the facts about Fourier transforms and equation (A.20) we conclude
 127 that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(\theta) = \sum_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S} P[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_S | \text{starting stage } i] \widehat{\kappa}_1(\theta)^{m_1} \dots \widehat{\kappa}_S(\theta)^{m_S}. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

128 Now this is indeed similar to equation (A.14), so the sum here can be exactly
 129 computed using the generating function equation (A.16).

130 A.5 Method for Stages

131 Start with choosing a large number N , fix the starting stage i , then find the
 132 frequencies as in equation (A.7). For each frequency $\theta(z)$ and every stage j ,
 133 compute the Fourier transforms $\widehat{\kappa}_j(\theta(z))$, and then make the matrix

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\kappa}_1(\theta(z)) & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \widehat{\kappa}_2(\theta(z)) & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

134 Remembering the generating function, use equations (A.21) and (A.22)
 135 to compute the quantity

$$\mathbf{V} = \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{d} \text{ with components } \{V_i\}.$$

136 Then use equation (A.21) to conclude that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(\theta(z)) = V_i. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

137 Repeat for all frequencies. Thus one computes the set of (scalar) values
138 $\widehat{\Gamma}(\theta(0)), \widehat{\Gamma}(\theta(1)), \dots$ and hence the function $\widehat{\Gamma}$.

139 Final step: use the Inverse FFT to find Γ .

140 Note: since every age+stage model can be cast as a stage-only model,
141 this method can also be used for age-only or age+stage models. But the age-
142 structured analysis in the main text explains the basic logic that the general
143 method does not. The age-based method is often computationally useless
144 for stage based or age+stage models when we have a large number of stages,
145 or when individuals can stay in a stage for a long time. In such cases, the
146 method here is essential.

147 **A.6 Block method for age+stage**

148 An age+stage model has ages $a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$, stages $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$. A
149 unique age+stage combination is written a, s , and there are $A \times S$ such
150 combinations. In some cases, the general method of the preceding section
151 may be computationally lengthy and the method described below is faster.

152 **A.6.1 Inverse**

153 To make it efficient to find the generating function, start by computing the
154 inverse of the matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}), \quad (\text{A.24})$$

in which $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{U}^T$. Here $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is a diagonal matrix as in equation (A.22). Suppose that we have S stages at each age, and that ages $a = 1, 2, \dots, A - 1$ have corresponding and distinct $S \times S$ transition matrices $\mathbf{U}_a = \mathbf{Q}_a^T$. The transition matrix $\mathbf{U}_A = \mathbf{Q}_A^T$ for age A is repeating, and applies at age $A + 1, A + 2, \dots$ until death. Note that for this case, there are total $A * S$ stages. Write the diagonal elements of $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ for a given frequency, $\theta(z)$, as

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = (\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_A), \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_a = (\widehat{\kappa_{a,1}}(\theta(z)), \widehat{\kappa_{a,2}}(\theta(z)), \dots, \widehat{\kappa_{a,S}}(\theta(z))), \quad (\text{A.26})$$

155 and the matrix of transition probabilities as

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{Q}_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{Q}_2 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \mathbf{Q}_{A-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{Q}_A \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

156 We can write the matrix of equation (A.24) in block form as

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & \dots & \mathbf{B}_{A-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.28})$$

where

$$\mathbf{B}_a = -\mathbf{Q}_a \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{a+1}, (a < A), \quad (\text{A.29})$$

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_A \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_A. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

157 Now use the result in Singh (1979) applied to block matrices. It is best
158 to write this first in cases and then in general. First, say that $A = 5$ so that

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B}_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

159 where

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_5 \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_5. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

160 Then

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{B}_1 & \mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{B}_2 & -\mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{B}_2\mathbf{B}_3 & \mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{B}_2\mathbf{B}_3\mathbf{B}_4\mathbf{C}^{-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{B}_2 & \mathbf{B}_2\mathbf{B}_3 & -\mathbf{B}_2\mathbf{B}_3\mathbf{B}_4\mathbf{C}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{B}_3 & \mathbf{B}_3\mathbf{B}_4\mathbf{C}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{B}_4\mathbf{C}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{C}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.33})$$

161 In general, the inverse matrix for equation (A.28) has the form

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{J}_{1,2} & \mathbf{J}_{1,3} & \dots & \mathbf{J}_{1,A} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{J}_{2,3} & \dots & \mathbf{J}_{2,A} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{J}_{A-1,A} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Here,

$$\mathbf{J}_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} \left\{ \prod_{k=i}^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_k \right\}, \text{ for } i < j \leq (A-1), \quad (\text{A.35})$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{i,A} = (-1)^{i+j} \left\{ \prod_{k=i}^{A-1} \mathbf{B}_k \right\} \mathbf{C}^{-1}, \text{ for } j = A. \quad (\text{A.36})$$

162 A.6.2 The Generating Function

163 Fix a starting stage i out of all $A \times S$ combinations, where S is the number of
 164 stages in a given age and A is the age where the transition matrix $\mathbf{U}_A$ starts
 165 repeating for following age. Death rates by age+stage are elements (there
 166 are $A \times S$ elements) of the vector

$$\mathbf{d} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{d}_1 \\ \mathbf{d}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{d}_A \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.37})$$

$$\mathbf{d}_a = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{d}_{a,1} \\ \mathbf{d}_{a,2} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{d}_{a,S} \end{pmatrix}.$$

167 The generating function is

$$\mathbf{V} = \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{d}, \quad (\text{A.38})$$

168 We start with the product

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{d}, \quad (\text{A.39})$$

169 which is a vector of A blocks, each S -long.

Using the pattern in equations (A.33 – A.36), we define a sequence:

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_A = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{d}_A, \quad (\text{A.40})$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{A-1} = \mathbf{d}_{A-1} - \mathbf{B}_{A-1} \hat{\mathbf{d}}_A, \quad (\text{A.41})$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{A-2} = \mathbf{d}_{A-2} - \mathbf{B}_{A-2} \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{A-1}, \quad (\text{A.42})$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_a = \mathbf{d}_a - \mathbf{B}_a \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{a+1}, \quad 1 \leq a \leq (A-1). \quad (\text{A.43})$$

170 Then set

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}} = (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{d}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{d}}_A)^T, \quad (\text{A.44})$$

171 so finally

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{d} = \hat{\mathbf{d}}. \quad (\text{A.45})$$

172 Therefore the generating function is

$$\mathbf{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{A \times S}\} = \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \hat{\mathbf{d}}. \quad (\text{A.46})$$

173 This quantity gives us the Fourier Transform $\hat{\Gamma}$ of the LRS distribution Γ –
 174 which is the distribution we want. So at the given frequency $\theta(k)$ we have
 175 found that

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\theta(k)) = V_i. \quad (\text{A.47})$$

176 Repeat for all frequencies. Thus one computes the set of (scalar) values
 177 $\hat{\Gamma}(\theta(0)), \hat{\Gamma}(\theta(1)), \dots$ and hence the function $\hat{\Gamma}$. The inverse Fourier transform
 178 then yields Γ .

179 **A.7 Special probabilities: Ages only**

180 To compute $\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0]$, observe that an individual has 0 offspring if it
 181 either (a) dies before reaching reproductive age α or (b) survives through
 182 the pre-reproductive period, but has 0 offspring thereafter. At reproductive
 183 ages a the probability of having 0 offspring is $\kappa_a(0)$. Assuming survival, the
 184 cumulative probability of having had no offspring by age a is

$$p'_a = \kappa_1(0) \kappa_2(0) \dots \kappa_a(0). \quad (\text{A.48})$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\text{LRS} = 0] &= (1 - l_\alpha) + \\ &+ \sum_{a \geq \alpha}^{\beta-1} \phi_a p'_a + \\ &+ l_\beta p'_\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{A.49}$$

185 The first line gives us (a) above, the second line adds in reproduction at
186 intermediate ages weighted by the odds of death, and the third line gives us
187 the final contribution to childlessness.

188 A.8 Special probabilities: Stages

To compute $\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0]$ here, we need a different method. Each stage i has a corresponding probability that an individual in that stage produces 0 offspring. This probability is 1 for non-reproducing stages, and $\kappa_i(0)$ for all other stages i . Define $\mathbf{W}_{\text{zero}}$ to be a diagonal matrix whose elements are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{\text{zero}}(i, i) &= 1, \text{ non-reproductive stage } i, \\ \mathbf{W}_{\text{zero}}(i, i) &= \kappa_i(0), \text{ reproductive stage } i. \end{aligned} \tag{A.50}$$

189 Use the definitions of the preceding section and compute

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{zero}} = \mathbf{W}_{\text{zero}} \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{W}_{\text{zero}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{d}. \tag{A.51}$$

190 Then the i th component of $\mathbf{V}_{\text{zero}}$ is

$$\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0 \mid \text{initial stage } i].$$

191 Since every age+stage model can be cast as a stage-only model, this
192 answer can also be used for any model.

193 For some life cycles we can also compute

$$\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0 \mid \text{die without reaching a stage capable of reproduction}]$$

194 Suppose we start in a non-reproductive stage. In suitable lifecycles, every
195 individual eventually makes an irreversible transition to one or more repro-
196 ducing stages, or dies. Here it makes sense to treat the reproducing stages as
197 “absorbing” and then $(1 - \text{the absorption probability})$ is just what we want.
198 See Caswell (2001) or Kemeny and Snell (1976) for details on how to do this.

199 **A.9 Special distributions**

200 **A.9.1 Poisson**

201 Here the average fertility is f_i for stage i , and κ_i is a Poisson distribution.
202 So κ_i has the probability generating function

$$\kappa_i(x) = \exp[f_i(x - 1)], \quad (\text{A.52})$$

203 for x a dummy variable.

204 So for stage j , and any frequency $\theta(k)$ as defined in equation (A.7), the
205 Fourier transform is

$$\hat{\kappa}_j(\theta(z)) = \exp[f_j(\theta(z) - 1)]. \quad (\text{A.53})$$

206 **A.9.2 Binomial**

207 Here the average fertility is f_i for stage i , and κ_i is a Binomial (with 1 trial,
208 also known as a Bernoulli) distribution. So κ_i has the probability generating
209 function

$$\kappa_i(x) = \kappa_i(0) + (1 - \kappa_i(0))x, \quad (\text{A.54})$$

210 where $\kappa_i(0)$ is the probability that an individual in stage i has 0 offspring
211 and x is a dummy variable.

212 So for stage i , and any frequency $\theta(k)$ as defined in equation (A.7), the
213 Fourier transform is

$$\hat{\kappa}_i(\theta(z)) = \kappa_i(0) + (1 - \kappa_i(0))\theta(z). \quad (\text{A.55})$$

214 **A.10 Roe deer plots**

215 Small offspring have a high mode at 0, and thus the highest probability
216 of leaving no offspring. Neither the average LRS nor the standard deviation
217 seem to be useful descriptors of the LRS distribution for the smallest yearlings
218 (plotted in the Appendix, Fig. A.1). For the full spectrum of size class,
219 Fig. A.2 shows 41 initial stages spread over size class 1 to 200. Between size
220 class 5 to 200, there are 5 size class interval between each curve. Fig. A.3
221 shows the $\Pr[\text{LRS} = 0]$ declines with increasing birth mass.

Figure A.1: The LRS distribution of Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus*. Mean LRS = 1.01 and the standard deviation is 1.34.

Figure A.2: The LRS distribution of Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus*. There are 41 initial stages. Solid points are for yearlings in size class 1. The gradient gray lines are the distribution spread over size class 5 to 200 with interval 5.

Figure A.3: The probability that $LRS = 0$ for different initial size classes for yearlings of Roe deer *Capreolus capreolus*. The blue dashed line shows the yearling death probability. The red dotted line shows the probability of having no offspring if you live to later ages.

222 A.11 The flow chart of decisions

Figure A.4: The flow chart of decisions. Survival probabilities (Table 1) and/or survival-transition matrices (Table 1); Reproduction distributions κ_a , κ_j , $\kappa_{a,j}$ (Table 1).

$f_a, 0 \leq f_a \leq k_m$	Mean number offspring produced by individuals in age interval a . $f_a = \sum_k k \kappa_a(k)$, $f_a = 0$ for $a < \alpha$ and $a > \beta$.
$f_j, 0 \leq f_j \leq k_m$	Mean number offspring produced during one time interval by individuals in stage j . $f_a = \sum_k k \kappa_j(k)$, $f_j = 0$ for non-reproductive stages.
$R_0 = \sum_a l_a f_a, a = 1, 2, \dots, \omega$	Net Reproductive Rate, mean life time reproductive success.
k_m	Maximum number of offspring that can be produced by an individual during one time interval.
$k_m + 1$	Number of elements in a vector where each element references one possible number of offspring produced by an individual during one time interval.
$2k_m + 1$	Number of elements in a vector representing number of offspring produced cumulatively during two time intervals.
δ	Vector of probabilities that an individual produces a total of k offspring after reproducing at 2 different ages, $\delta(k)$, conditional on being alive at each of these ages. $\delta = \kappa_1 \star \kappa_2$, Convolution of κ_1 and κ_2 (see main text Method:Age-only Model for computation)

Table A.1: Definitions

References

- Caswell, Hal (2001). *Matrix Population Models: Construction, Analysis, and Interpretation*. 2nd. Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, MA.
- James, J. F. (2002). *A Student's Guide to Fourier Transforms : With Applications in Physics and Engineering*. Vol. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 9780521808262. URL: <https://stanford.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=125073&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Kemeny, John G. and J. Laurie Snell (1976). *Finite Markov Chains*. Springer Verlag New York.
- Steiner, U.K. and S. Tuljapurkar (2012). "Neutral theory for life histories and individual variability in fitness components". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, pp. 4684–4689.