1 Appendix

We begin by giving new formulae for estimation of $F_{st}$. Suppose we have a biallelic marker in two populations in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. Choose the variant allele, and suppose that the allele has population frequency $p_1, p_2$ in populations 1 and 2 respectively. Set $q_i = 1 - p_i$. Then we can define Wright’s $F_{st}$ as

$$F_{st} = N/D$$

where

$$N = p_1(q_2 - q_1) + p_2(q_1 - q_2)$$
$$D = p_1q_2 + q_1p_2 = N + p_1q_1 + p_2q_2$$

This is a definition of $F_{st}$, a parameter measuring divergence at a given locus, not a sample statistic. In this paper we are only interested in divergence measures of biallelic markers and the theory will always assume the populations are homogeneous.

Suppose we have a set $S$ of markers $A_k (k = 1, \ldots, M)$. For marker $k$ we define now $N^{[k]}$ and $D^{[k]}$ in the obvious way. We now define $F(S) = F_{st}$ for the marker set $S$ by

$$F(S) = \frac{N(S)}{D(S)}$$

where

$$N(S) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} N^{[k]}$$
$$D(S) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} D^{[k]}$$

Given the form of equation (4) it is highly desirable to find unbiased estimators of $N^{[k]}, D^{[k]}$ else the bias will eventually dominate the estimate. Fix for now, marker $k$, and suppose the population frequencies are $p_1, p_2$ for the variant allele, and we observe allele counts $a_1, a_2$ for the variant allele, $b_1, b_2$ for the reference allele. Take $n_i = a_i + b_i$, $i = 1, 2$. $N = N^{[k]}$ is defined as $(p_1 - p_2)^2$. A naive estimator for $N$ is

$$X = (a_1/n_1 - a_2/n_2)^2$$

We calculate the bias of $X$. Writing

$$X = ((a_1/n_1 - p_1) - (a_2/n_2 - p_2) + (p_1 - p_2))^2$$

Then

$$E(X) = (p_1 - p_2)^2 + Var(a_1/n_1|p_1) + Var(a_2/n_2|p_2)$$
$$= (p_1 - p_2)^2 + p_1(1 - p_1)/n_1 + p_2(1 - p_2)/n_2$$
Define \( h_1 = p_1(1 - p_1) \) (\( 2h_1 \) is the heterozygosity at the marker for population 1). Then a natural estimator for \( h_1 \) is
\[
\hat{h}_1 = \frac{a_1(n_1 - a_1)}{n_1(n_1 - 1)}
\] (9)

It is easy to check that \( \hat{h}_1 \) is unbiased. Similarly define \( h_2 \) for population 2, with a corresponding estimator \( \hat{h}_2 \). This is enough to show that:
\[
\hat{N} = \frac{(a_1/n_1 - a_2/n_2)^2 - \hat{h}_1/n_1 - \hat{h}_2/n_2}{n_1(n_1 - 1)}
\] (10)

is an unbiased estimator for \( N \). Now
\[
D = N + h_1 + h_2
\]

which shows
\[
\hat{D} = \hat{N} + \hat{h}_1 + \hat{h}_2
\] (11)

is an unbiased estimator for \( D \).

By the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem [1, Theorem 4.2.2] \( \hat{N} \) and \( \hat{D} \) are uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimators. No longer fixing a marker and writing \( \hat{N}^{[k]} \) for our estimator of \( N^{[k]} \), and so on, we see that a natural estimator for \( F(S) \) is
\[
\hat{F} = \frac{\sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]}}{\sum_k \hat{D}^{[k]}}
\] (12)

Note that (12) does not give an unbiased estimator. However the law of large numbers does imply that as sample size or the number of unlinked markers become large we get an estimator that is asymptotically consistent.

Given our assumptions, our estimates of \( N^{[k]} \), \( D^{[k]} \) are exactly unbiased both here and in the section below. Our formulae are different from those of Weir and Cockerham [6], at least when population sample sizes differ.

1.1 Estimators in the presence of inbreeding

The estimators above are not correct if there is inbreeding. We continue to assume that within a population there is no structure, but no longer assume that the pair of chromosomes of each sample are unrelated. Thus we may have excess homozygosity compared with Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium.

We extend our theory to this case. We give estimators of \( N \), \( D \) that are unbiased, without explicitly estimating the inbreeding coefficients. Let \( x_0, x_1, x_2 \) be the number of samples of population 1 with 0, 1, 2 copies of the variant allele. Let \( y_0, y_1, y_2 \) be the corresponding numbers for population 2. Let
\[
 s = x_0 + x_1 + x_2 \\
 t = y_0 + y_1 + y_2
\]
We will require that $s, t > 1$. In the notation of the previous section:

\[
\begin{align*}
a_1 &= x_1 + 2x_2 \\
a_2 &= y_1 + 2y_2 \\
n_1 &= 2s \\
n_2 &= 2t
\end{align*}
\]

which will lead to estimators for $N, D$. In the presence of inbreeding, these estimators are incorrect. Note however that if we pick alleles randomly from each diplotype, then we will obtain valid unbiased estimators. We can of course then obtain more efficient estimators by averaging over our choice of alleles.

Select an allele at random from each diploid genotype. Let $u$ be the allele count for population 1, and $v$ be the count for population 2. From equation (10) we want to compute expected values of:

\[
X = \left( \frac{u}{s} - \frac{v}{t} \right)^2
\]

\[
\hat{h}_1 = \frac{u(s-u)}{s(s-1)}
\]

\[
\hat{h}_2 = \frac{v(t-v)}{t(t-1)}
\]

when our estimator for $N$ is

\[
\hat{N} = E(X) - E(\hat{h}_1)/s - E(\hat{h}_2)/t
\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(13)}

For $X$, we see that $u$ has mean $x_1/2 + x_2$ and variance $x_1/4$. Similarly $v$ has mean $y_1/2 + y_2$ and variance $y_1/4$. It follows that

\[
E(X) = \left( \frac{x_1 + 2x_2}{2s} - \frac{y_1 + 2y_2}{2t} \right)^2 + \frac{x_1}{4s^2} + \frac{y_1}{4t^2}
\]

For $E(\hat{h})$ we need the expected value of $u(s-u)$. Standard binomial coefficient identities show that

\[
E(u(s-u)) = x_0 x_2 + (x_0 + x_2)x_1/2 + x_1(x_1 - 1)/4
\]

Now it follows that:

\[
E(\hat{h}_1) = \frac{x_0 x_2 + (x_0 + x_2)x_1/2 + x_1(x_1 - 1)/4}{s(s-1)}
\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(14)}

\[
E(\hat{h}_2) = \frac{y_0 y_2 + (y_0 + y_2)y_1/2 + y_1(y_1 - 1)/4}{t(t-1)}
\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(15)}

We now can apply equation (13) to obtain $\hat{N}$. For $\hat{D}$ we have, using $D = N + h_1 + h_2$ the equation

\[
\hat{D} = \hat{N} + E(\hat{h}_1) + E(\hat{h}_2)
\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(16)}
These formulae are slightly different from those of [5] who correct for inbreeding by directly estimating an inbreeding ‘fixation index’ (see below) and state that their estimates of the numerator $N$ and denominator $D$ are only ‘approximately unbiased’. (see their equation (8)). We now obtain, using estimates over many markers

$$\hat{F} = \frac{\sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]} }{\sum_k \hat{D}^{[k]} } \tag{17}$$

where $\hat{N}^{[k]}, \hat{D}^{[k]}$ are the estimators above, robust to inbreeding, for marker $k$. Just as before, the estimator of (17) is not unbiased but asymptotically consistent as the number of unlinked markers becomes large.

The same ideas lead to a simple estimator of the inbreeding coefficient, $p_I$, the probability, in a sample from a population, that the two alleles at a locus are identical by descent (IBD). For our case, with an assumed homogeneous population, this is the same as Wright’s fixation index $F$. (See [4, page 154]). Consider population 1, with the same notation as above. Let $H$ be the probability that two alleles from an individual are heterozygous. Then

$$H = (1 - p_I)h$$

so that $p_I = (h - H)/h$. An unbiased estimator of $H$ is

$$\hat{H} = \frac{x_1}{s}$$

Thus we obtain a natural estimate of $p_I$:

$$\hat{p}_I = \frac{\sum (h - \hat{H})}{\sum h} \tag{18}$$

where we sum over all SNPs in our data.

We have not yet worked out the theory, but it would appear that these estimators of $F_{st}$ have, in the absence of inbreeding, standard errors that are only a little increased from the ‘optimal’ estimators using equations (10, 11).

2 $f$-statistics

We now discuss our $f$-statistics. $f_4$ is the simplest. We have 4 distinct populations $W, X, Y, Z$. An allele has population frequencies $w, x, y, z$ respectively. We observe counts $w_0, w_1$ of the allele and the complementary allele in a sample from population W. Similarly we observe counts $x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, z_0, z_1$. We will assume that the total count for each population is at least 2. Thus the natural (naive) estimator of $w$ is

$$w' = \frac{w_0}{w_0 + w_1}$$

We now discuss our $f$-statistics. $f_4$ is the simplest. We have 4 distinct populations $W, X, Y, Z$. An allele has population frequencies $w, x, y, z$ respectively. We observe counts $w_0, w_1$ of the allele and the complementary allele in a sample from population W. Similarly we observe counts $x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1, z_0, z_1$. We will assume that the total count for each population is at least 2. Thus the natural (naive) estimator of $w$ is

$$w' = \frac{w_0}{w_0 + w_1}$$
with similar definitions of \( x', y', z' \). We wish to form unbiased estimates of quantities such as \((w - x)(y - z)\) which we term an \( f_4 \)-statistic. It is easy to see that the naive estimate

\[
f_4(W, X, Y, Z) = (w' - x')(y' - z')
\]

indeed is an unbiased estimator. Next suppose we want an estimator \( f_3 \)-statistic for \((w - x)(w - y)\) where \( w \) appears twice. Consider the naive estimator:

\[
q = (w' - x')(w' - y')
\]

Then we can write \( q \) as

\[
q = ((w' - w) - (x' - x) + (w - x))((w' - w) - (y' - y) + (w - y))
\]

This shows that the bias of \( q \) is \( E(w' - w)^2 \). Let \( n_W = w_0 + w_1 \) be the total allele count for \( W \). Then

\[
E(w' - w)^2 = \frac{w(1 - w)}{n_W}
\]

Define \( h_W = w(1 - w) \)

(2 \( h_W \) is the heterozygosity at the marker for population \( W \)). Then a natural estimator for \( h_W \) is \( \hat{h}_W \) defined analogously to \( h_1 \).

\[
f_3(W, X, Y) = (w' - x')(w' - y') - \hat{h}_W/n_W
\]

and \( f_3 \) is an unbiased estimator of \((w - x)(w - y)\). Similarly we can define

\[
f_2(W, X) = (w' - x')(w' - x') - \hat{h}_W/n_W - \hat{h}_X/n_X
\]

and show that \( f_2(W, X) \) is an unbiased estimator of \((w - x)^2\).

In applications we always wish to compute weighted sums of the \( f \)-statistics across many markers. Unbiasedness is critical here ensuring convergence of our average \( f \)-statistic to the average we would obtain by using the true allele frequencies.

### 2.1 The Denominator

For \( f = Fst \) we have shown how to compute estimators for marker \( k \) \( \hat{N}^{[k]}, \hat{D}^{[k]} \).

Our estimate \( \hat{F} \) for \( F \) is now simply:

\[
\hat{F} = \frac{\sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]}}{\sum_k \hat{D}^{[k]}}
\]

For our \( f \)-statistics we have some choices. Our key idea is that the denominator should not be population dependent. All our statistics are valid under any reasonable choice, and what we did was the following.

We picked an outgroup (Hapmap Yoruba (YRI)), chosen as a ‘neutral’ population relative to the non-African populations studied here.
1. For our graph calculations in Figure 4 we wanted to mimic our $F_{st}$ estimates closely, and the $f$-statistics are

$$\frac{s \sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]}}{\sum_k \hat{D}^{[k]}}$$

where $\hat{D}^{[k]}$ is $p_k(1-p_k)$, and $p_k$ is the empirical frequency of the variant allele at marker $i$ in YRI. We require $0 < p_k < 1$. Here, $s$ is an arbitrary scalar, unimportant for the analysis. Our $f$-statistics have no denominator and so are in some sense ‘dimensionless’. (Of course when we apply a statistical test, such as a Z-score, the statistic is invariant to scaling). The raw $f$-statistics are dependent on irrelevant quantities, such as the allelic spectrum of ascertained markers, and thus are not comparable across different data sets. We chose to scale $f_2$ to minimize the deviations from $F_{st}$ by least squares, considering all pairs of populations in the analysis being carried out. We then rescale $f_3, f_4$ using the same scale factor. This makes all our quantities have units on the same scale as $F_{st}$ and make our inferences interpretable as genetic drift. The only effect of the outgroup here is to force our markers to be polymorphic in our YRI samples — this is appropriate for our purposes, as ‘private’ alleles are not of interest here.

2. For our 4-population test we use the formula:

$$\hat{f} = \sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]} / \hat{D}^{[k]}$$

where $\hat{D}^{[k]}$ is defined as above. This seemed to give more sensitivity. Note that any weighting of the $\hat{N}^{[k]}$ is statistically valid (here we use weights $1/\hat{D}^{[k]}$), at least if the weights are chosen only using outgroup data. We do not yet understand what ‘optimal’ weights would be, in terms of statistical power.

3. For our 3-population test where we are estimating $(p_X - p_Y)(p_X - p_W)$ the population $X$ plays a distinguished role in this expression (and indeed we are testing here the genetic history of $X$). We therefore set $\hat{D}^{[k]}$ to be an unbiased estimate of the heterozygosity at marker $k$ for population $X$ (using (9)). We use

$$\hat{f}_3 = \frac{\sum_k \hat{N}^{[k]} \hat{D}^{[k]} \hat{D}^{[k]}}{\sum_k \hat{D}^{[k]}}$$

In all cases standard errors (and statistical significance) are estimated through a weighted block jackknife [3, 2]. We use a block size of 5$cM$.

2.2 Expected values of our $f$-statistics

We can calculate expected values, at least for simple demographies, involving
populations splits and admixture events (but not yet migrations occurring con-
tinuously in time). We give an illustration for our $f_3$-statistics. Consider a
demography:

Here, populations $A'$, $B'$ split from a root population $R$. $C'$ then was formed
by admixture in proportions $\alpha : \beta$ ($\beta = 1 - \alpha$). Modern populations $A, B, C$ are
then formed by drift from $A', B', C'$. We want to calculate the expected value
of $f_3(C; A, B)$ That is we want

$$F_3 = E(f_C - f_A, f_C - f_B)$$

where $f_A, f_B, f_C$ are allele frequencies in $A, B, C$ respectively. We see by or-
thogonality of drifts that

$$F_3(C; A, B) = E(f_{C'} - f_A, f_{C'} - f_B) + E((f_{C'} - f_C)^2).$$

($f_{C'}$ is the allele frequency in $C'$) which we will write as

$$F_3(C; A, B) = F_3(C'; A, B) + F_2(C, C')$$

Now, label alleles at a marker 0, 1. Then picking chromosomes from our popu-
lations independently we can write

$$F_3(C'; A, B) = E(c' - a)(c'' - b)$$

where $a, b, c', c''$ are alleles in populations $A, B, C'$. However $c'$ originated from
$A'$ with probability $\alpha$ and so on. Thus:

$$F_3(C'; A, B) = E(c' - a)(c'' - b)$$

$$= \alpha^2 E(a' - a)(a'' - b) + \beta^2 E(b' - a)(b'' - b) + \alpha\beta E(a' - a)(b' - b) + \alpha\beta E(b' - a)(a' - b)$$

where $a', a''$ are independently picked from $A'$ and $b', b''$ from $B'$. The first 3
terms vanish Further

$$E(b' - a)(a' - b) = -E((a' - b')^2)$$
and we obtain, using (19):

\[ F_3(C; A, B) = F_2(C, C') - \alpha \beta F_2(A', B') \]  

(20)

This last equation will have a negative right-hand side if there is little drift between \( C, C' \), \( \alpha \) is not close to 0 or 1 and \( A', B' \) have substantially drifted. Note that drift between \( A' \) and \( A \) and also between \( B' \) and \( B \) is immaterial here.

It is worth commenting that this is very specifically a test for admixture of population \( C \) and complex demography in the history of \( A \) and \( B \) does not effect the validity of the test. For example suppose we have two modern populations \( A, B \) formed by recent admixture of populations \( A_0, B_0 \). In an obvious notation

\[ A = w_1 A_0 + w_2 B_0, \quad B = v_1 A_0 + v_2 B_0 \]

where

\[ w_1 + w_2 = v_1 + v_2 = 1 \]

Then by a similar argument to that above we find that

\[ f_3(C; A, B) = f_3(C; w_1 A_0 + w_2 B_0, v_1 A_0 + v_2 B_0) \]

\[ = w_1 v_1 f_2(C, A_0) + w_2 v_2 f_2(C, B_0) + (w_1 v_2 + w_2 v_1) f_3(C; A_0, B_0) \]

and so \( f_3(C; A, B) < 0 \) implies \( f_3(C; A_0, B_0) < 0 \). The complex recent admixture has weakened the test, but not removed the validity.

2.3 \( f_3 \) and \( f_4 \) statistics can be formed from \( f_2 \).

From the identity

\[(a - b)^2 = ((c - a) - (c - b))^2 = (c - a)^2 + (c - b)^2 - 2(c - a)(c - b)\]

It follows that

\[ 2 f_3(C; A, B) = f_2(C, A) + f_2(C, B) - f_2(A, B) \]  

(21)

Next, writing

\[ d - b = c - b - (c - d) \]

It follows that

\[ f_4(C, A; D, B) = f_3(C; A, B) - f_3(C; A, D) \]  

(22)

Also \( f_4(E, A; D, B) = f_4(C, A; D, B) - f_4(C, E; D, B) \). This shows that given knowledge of all the \( f_2 \) statistics, then all \( f_3, f_4 \) statistics can be computed. Conversely, fix a population \( C \) and suppose we know \( f_3(C; A, B) \) for all populations \( A, B \) and also \( f_2(C, A) \) for every \( A \). Then equation (21) shows that \( f_2(A, B) \) is determined for all \( A, B \) and therefore all \( f_3, f_4 \) statistics are determined.

In calculations it is convenient to pick a basis for the \( f \)-statistics. Two natural bases are:
1. $f_2(A,B)$ for all $A,B$.

2. For a fixed $C$ (usually an outgroup) $f_3(C;A,B)$ and $f_2(C,A)$ for all $A,B$.
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