

# The Derivation Algebra of Gametic Algebra for Linked Loci

LUIZ A. PERESI

*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo,  
Caixa Postal 20570, São Paulo, Brazil 01498*

*Received 21 October 1986; revised 29 July 1987*

---

## ABSTRACT

It is known that a derivation of a genetic algebra has genetic meaning and reflects the symmetries of the algebra. Some well-known results on Lie groups are used to give a structure theorem for the derivation algebra of gametic algebra for linked loci.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider an infinite randomly mating population, not subject to selection, of diploid individuals which differ in  $k$  linked loci. Assume that the number of possible alleles in the  $m$ th locus is  $r_m + 1$ . If  $U'$  and  $U''$  are complementary subsets of  $K = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , we indicate by  $U = (U', U'') = (U'', U')$  the partition of  $K$  determined by  $U'$  and  $U''$ . For a given  $U$ , we assume that in the zygotes the loci in  $U'$  are considered as one block, the loci in  $U''$  as another block, and recombination occurs between the blocks with probability  $\lambda(U)$ . The gametic inheritance for all  $k$  loci has been extensively studied by algebraic methods [1–5]. In this paper, we adopt the approach given by Heuch [2].

To this genetic model there corresponds the real commutative algebra  $G$  called the gametic algebra for linked loci. A canonical basis for  $G$  may be formally represented by the set of monomials

$$X_{i^*} \equiv X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_k} \quad (0 \leq i_m \leq r_m, \quad 1 \leq m \leq k),$$

where  $i^*$  is the multiindex  $(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ , and the multiplication table is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{0^*}^2 &= X_{0^*} \quad [0^* \text{ is the multiindex } (0, 0, \dots, 0)]; \\ X_{i^*} X_{j^*} &= \begin{cases} \lambda(i^*, j^*) X_{i^* + j^*} & \text{if } s(i^*) \cap s(j^*) = \phi, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$s(i^*)$  is the set  $\{t \in K: i_t \neq 0\}$ , and  $2\lambda(i^*, j^*) = \sum \lambda(U)$ , where the sum is taken over the collection of all partitions  $U$  with  $s(i^*)$  contained in one of the sets  $U'$  or  $U''$  and  $s(j^*)$  in the other.

A derivation  $d$  of  $G$  is a linear map  $d: G \rightarrow G$  verifying  $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$ . The set  $\text{Der}(G)$  of all derivations is closed under the Lie bracket  $[d, d'] = dd' - d'd$ , and it is a Lie algebra.

Holgate [7] gave an explanation of the genetic meaning of derivations in genetic algebras. Briefly, if we have a genetically determined trait with array of values  $d$  and  $d$  is a derivation, then the above equation verified by  $d$  reflects a kind of symmetry in the time direction.

The purpose of this paper is to determine the derivations of  $G$ . This is done by using Lie group theory.

## 2. AUTOMORPHISMS

An automorphism of  $G$  is a nonsingular linear map  $\psi: G \rightarrow G$  that preserves products:  $\psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)$ . The collection of all automorphisms of  $G$  is a group, which we indicate by  $\text{Aut}(G)$ .

In this section, we shall get some results about automorphisms that we shall use to obtain the derivations of  $G$ .

Given a  $k$ -tuple  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ , where  $a_m$  ( $1 \leq m \leq k$ ) is an  $(r_m + 1) \times (r_m + 1)$  real matrix  $(a_{mij})$ , and multiindices  $i^*, j^*$ , we denote the product  $a_{1i_1j_1} \cdots a_{ki_kj_k}$  by  $a_{i^*j^*}$ . We define the linear map  $\bar{a}$  of  $G$  by setting

$$\bar{a}(X_{j^*}) = \sum_{i^*=0^*}^{r^*} a_{i^*j^*} X_{i^*}.$$

Let  $A(m)$  ( $1 \leq m \leq k$ ) be the affine group of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (i.e., the set of all nonsingular matrices  $a_m$  with  $a_{m00} = 1$  and  $a_{m0j} = 0$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r_m$ ). We designate by  $\bar{A}$  the set of all  $\bar{a}$  with  $a$  in the direct product  $A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k)$ .

### PROPOSITION

- (i) The map  $a \in A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k) \rightarrow \bar{a} \in \bar{A}$  is an isomorphism of groups.
- (ii)  $\bar{A}$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(G)$ .

*Proof.* Statement (i) is clear. In order to prove (ii) it is enough to show that  $\bar{a}$  preserves products, since  $\bar{a}$  is nonsingular by (i). From [3, p. 37] it follows that  $\bar{a}(X_{0^*})$  is an idempotent of  $G$  and thus  $\bar{a}$  preserves the product  $X_{0^*}X_{0^*}$ . Let  $p^*, q^*$  be multiindices with  $q^* \neq 0^*$ . To prove that  $\bar{a}$  preserves  $X_{p^*}X_{q^*}$ , we shall analyze two cases:  $s(p^*) \cap s(q^*) \neq \phi$  and  $s(p^*) \cap s(q^*) = \phi$ . We have

$$\bar{a}(X_{p^*})\bar{a}(X_{q^*}) = \sum_{m^*, n^*=0^*}^{r^*} a_{m^*p^*}a_{n^*q^*}X_{m^*}X_{n^*}.$$

Since  $a_{i0p_i} = a_{j0q_j} = 0$  for any  $i \in s(p^*)$  and  $j \in s(q^*)$ , we assume that in the above sum  $m^*, n^*$  are such that  $s(p^*) \subset s(m^*)$  and  $s(q^*) \subset s(n^*)$ . When  $s(p^*) \cap s(q^*) \neq \emptyset$ , we have  $s(m^*) \cap s(n^*) \neq \emptyset$  and thus  $\bar{a}(X_{p^*})\bar{a}(X_{q^*}) = 0 = \bar{a}(X_{p^*}X_{q^*})$ . Now, suppose that  $s(p^*) \cap s(q^*) = \emptyset$ . The component of  $\bar{a}(X_{p^*})\bar{a}(X_{q^*})$  in the direction of  $X_{t^*}$ , in the case where  $s(p^*) \cup s(q^*) \subset s(t^*)$ , is  $[\sum \lambda(m^*, n^*)]a_{t^*, p^*+q^*}$ ; the sum is taken over all  $m^*, n^*$  with  $m^* + n^* = t^*$ ,  $s(m^*) \cap s(n^*) = \emptyset$ ,  $s(p^*) \subset s(m^*)$ , and  $s(q^*) \subset s(n^*)$ . As is readily seen,  $\sum \lambda(m^*, n^*) = \lambda(p^*, q^*)$ , and so the component is equal to  $\lambda(p^*, q^*)a_{t^*, p^*+q^*}$ . When  $s(p^*) \cup s(q^*) \not\subset s(t^*)$ , this component is zero. From this, it is now clear that

$$\bar{a}(X_{p^*})\bar{a}(X_{q^*}) = \bar{a}(X_{p^*}X_{q^*}).$$

We notice that if  $r_i \neq r_j$  for all  $i, j \in K$ ,  $i \neq j$ , we have  $\text{Aut}(G) = \bar{A}$  and then  $\text{Aut}(G)$  is isomorphic to  $A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k)$ . When  $r_i = r_j$  for some  $i \neq j$ , it seems that whether  $\bar{A}$  is or is not the automorphism group of  $G$  depends on the linkage distribution  $\{\lambda(U)\}$ . We do not give details here, because these facts are not necessary to prove the main result of the paper.

### 3. DERIVATIONS

The affine group of  $\mathbf{R}^m$  is a Lie group, and its Lie algebra is the vector space  $L(m) \equiv \mathbf{R}^m \oplus \text{gl}(r_m, \mathbf{R})$  with the Lie bracket  $[h, h'] = (c\delta' - c'\delta, cc' - c'c)$ , where  $\text{gl}(r_m, \mathbf{R})$  denotes the set of all  $r_m \times r_m$  real matrices,  $h = (\delta, c)$ , and  $h' = (\delta', c')$  [11, p. 192]. On the other hand, it is well known that if  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  are Lie groups with Lie algebras  $L_1, \dots, L_k$ , then the Lie algebra of the direct product  $G_1 \times \cdots \times G_k$  is the direct product of Lie algebras  $L_1 \times \cdots \times L_k$  [9, p. 10-9]. Therefore, the Lie algebra of  $A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k)$  is  $L(1) \times \cdots \times L(k)$ .

From the proposition, we have that the map

$$a \in A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k) \xrightarrow{\theta} \bar{a} \in \text{Aut}(G)$$

is a homomorphism of (abstract) groups; furthermore, since the coordinate functions of  $\theta$  are polynomials in the indeterminates  $a_{mij}$ ,  $\theta$  is  $C^\infty$ . We may thus conclude that  $\theta$  is a homomorphism of Lie groups. Therefore, the differential map

$$d\theta: L(1) \times \cdots \times L(k) \rightarrow \text{Dcr}(G)$$

is a homomorphism of Lie algebras (see [10, Theorem 3.14] and recall that the Lie algebra of the automorphism group of  $G$  is its derivation algebra  $\text{Der}(G)$  [10, Theorem 3.54]). Hence, given a  $k$ -tuple  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ , where  $(h_{mij}) \in L(m)$ ,  $d = d\theta \cdot h$  is a derivation of  $G$ .

The coordinate function of  $\theta$  in the direction of  $(X_{i^*}, X_{j^*})$  [i.e., the function that maps the element  $a$  of  $A(1) \times \cdots \times A(k)$  to the coordinate of  $\bar{a}(X_{i^*})$  in the direction of  $X_{j^*}$ ] is

$$a \xrightarrow{\psi} a_{1j_1i_1} \cdots a_{kj_ki_k}.$$

Since this is a polynomial function, it is easy to obtain its partial derivatives, and then to conclude that

$$d\psi \cdot h = h_{mt_m i_m} \quad \text{if } X_{1j_1} \cdots X_{kj_k} = X_{mt_m} X_{1i_1} \cdots \hat{X}_{mi_m} \cdots X_{ki_k} \quad (1 \leq t_m \leq r_m)$$

( $\hat{\phantom{x}}$  denotes absence) and  $d\psi \cdot h = 0$  in any other case. Therefore,

$$d(X_{i^*}) = \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{t_m=1}^{r_m} h_{mt_m i_m} X_{mt_m} \hat{X}_{i^*}, \quad (1)$$

where  $X_{mt_m} \hat{X}_{i^*}$  denotes  $X_{mt_m} X_{1i_1} \cdots \hat{X}_{mi_m} \cdots X_{ki_k}$ .

It is easy to see that  $d\theta$  is injective. Now, we claim that  $d\theta$  is onto. Let  $d$  be a derivation of  $G$ . We must prove that  $d$  is given by (1). Write

$$d(X_{i^*}) = \sum_{t^*=0^*}^{r^*} \alpha_{t^*, i^*} X_{t^*} \quad (\alpha_{t^*, i^*} \in \mathbf{R}).$$

If  $\omega: G \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is the linear form defined by  $\omega(X_{0^*}) = 1$ ,  $\omega(X_{t^*}) = 0$  ( $t^* \neq 0^*$ ), then  $\omega d = 0$  [6, Theorem 1]. It follows thus that  $\alpha_{0^*, i^*} = 0$ . Since  $X_{0^*}$  is an idempotent, we have  $d(X_{0^*}) = 2X_{0^*}d(X_{0^*})$  and so

$$\sum_{t^*=0^*}^{r^*} [1 - 2\lambda(0^*, t^*)] \alpha_{t^*, 0^*} X_{t^*} = 0.$$

Thus, if  $t^*$  has at least two nonzero coordinates, we have that  $\alpha_{t^*, 0^*} = 0$ , since  $2\lambda(0^*, t^*) < 1$  (as noticed in [3, p. 37], we may assume this condition without loss of generality). Next, assume that the only nonzero coordinate of  $t^*$  is the  $s$ th. Since  $d$  is derivation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t^*=0^*}^{r^*} \alpha_{t^*, i^*} X_{t^*} &= X_{0^*} \left( \sum_{t^*=0^*}^{r^*} \alpha_{t^*, i^*} X_{t^*} \right) \\ &+ X_{i^*} \left( \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{t_m=1}^{r_m} h_{mt_m 0} X_{mt_m} \hat{X}_{0^*} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $t^*$  has more than two nonzero coordinates or if  $t^*$  has exactly two nonzero coordinates and neither of them is the  $s$ th, we have (by the same argument used above) that  $\alpha_{t^*,i^*} = 0$ . On the other hand, let  $X_{p^*} = X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{0^*}$  ( $m \neq s$ ). If  $t^* = p^* + i^*$  then

$$\left[\frac{1}{2} - \lambda(0^*, t^*)\right] \alpha_{t^*,i^*} = \lambda(p^*, i^*) h_{m_{t_m}0}$$

and so  $\alpha_{t^*,i^*} = h_{m_{t_m}0}$ . Also, from  $X_{i^*} d(X_{i^*}) = 0$  we get  $\alpha_{t^*,i^*} = 0$ , when  $t^*$  has one nonzero coordinate and it is not the  $s$ th. Therefore,  $d(X_{i^*})$  is given by (1). Now, we finish the proof of our claim by induction. Assume that  $d(X_{i^*})$  has the form (1) for any  $i^*$  with no more than  $t-1$  nonzero coordinates. Let  $i^*$  be a multiindex with  $t$  nonzero coordinates, and take nonzero  $p^*, q^*$  such that  $p^* + q^* = i^*$  and  $s(p^*) \cap s(q^*) = \emptyset$ . Let  $t_m$  be such that  $1 \leq t_m \leq r_m$ . For  $m \in K$  with  $i_m \neq 0$  we obtain

$$X_{q^*}(X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{p^*}) = \begin{cases} \lambda(p^*, q^*) X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{i^*} & \text{if } q_m = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } q_m \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$X_{p^*}(X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{q^*}) = \begin{cases} \lambda(p^*, q^*) X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{i^*} & \text{if } p_m = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } p_m \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, for  $m \in K$  with  $i_m = 0$ , we get

$$X_{q^*}(X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{p^*}) = \lambda(q^*, n^*) X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{i^*}$$

and

$$X_{p^*}(X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{q^*}) = \lambda(p^*, m^*) X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{i^*},$$

where  $m^*$  ( $n^*$ ) is the sum of  $q^*$  ( $p^*$ , respectively) with the multiindex whose sole nonzero coordinate is the  $m$ th and is equal to  $t_m$ . It is immediate to verify that  $\lambda(p^*, m^*) + \lambda(q^*, n^*) = \lambda(p^*, q^*)$ . Thus, using again the fact that  $d$  is a derivation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(p^*, q^*) d(X_{i^*}) &= X_{q^*} \left( \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{t_m=1}^{r_m} h_{m_{t_m} p_m} X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{p^*} \right) \\ &\quad + X_{p^*} \left( \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{t_m=1}^{r_m} h_{m_{t_m} q_m} X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{q^*} \right) \\ &= \lambda(p^*, q^*) \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{t_m=1}^{r_m} h_{m_{t_m} i_m} X_{m_{t_m}} \hat{X}_{i^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $d(X_{i^*})$  is given by (1).

These considerations can be summarized as follows:

*THEOREM*

*The derivation algebra of  $G$  is isomorphic to the direct product of Lie algebras  $L(1) \times \cdots \times L(k)$ .*

The derivations of the corresponding zygotic algebra can be easily obtained from (1); see [8].

REFERENCES

- 1 P. Holgate, The genetic algebra of  $k$  linked loci, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 18:315–327 (1968).
- 2 I. Heuch, The linear algebra for linked loci with mutation, *Math. Biosci.* 16:263–271 (1973).
- 3 I. Heuch, Genetic algebras for systems with linked loci, *Math. Biosci.* 34:34–47 (1977); Erratum, *ibid.* 37:279 (1977).
- 4 P. Holgate, Canonical multiplication in the genetic algebra for linked loci, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 26:281–286 (1979).
- 5 P. Fortini and R. Barakat, An algorithm for gene frequency changes for linked autosomal loci based on genetic algebras, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 83:135–143 (1981).
- 6 R. Costa, On derivations of gametic algebras for polyploidy with multiple alleles, *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.* 13:69–81 (1982).
- 7 P. Holgate, The interpretation of derivations in genetic algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 85:75–79 (1987).
- 8 L. A. Peresi, A note on duplication of algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, to appear.
- 9 M. Spivak, *A Comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry*, Vol. I, Publish or Perish Inc., Boston, 1970.
- 10 F. W. Warner, *Foundations of Differentiable Manifolds and Lie Groups*, Scott, Foresman, Glenview, Ill., 1972.
- 11 P. Malliavin, *Géométrie Différentielle Intrinsèque*, Herman, Paris, 1975.