1   **Hill-Robertson interference may bias the inference of fitness effects of new mutations in**
2   **highly selfing species**
3
4   Austin Daigle[1,2,3] and Parul Johri[1,2,4,*]
5

6   [1]Department of Biology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599
7   [2]Department of Genetics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599
8   [3]Curriculum in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, University of North Carolina, Chapel
9   Hill, NC 27599
10   [4]Integrative Program for Biological & Genome Sciences, University of North Carolina, Chapel
11   Hill, NC 27599
12
13   *Correspondence can be addressed to these authors
14
15   Parul Johri
16   pjohri@unc.edu

17
18   **Running title**: Inferring fitness effects in selfing populations
19
20   **Keywords**: distribution of fitness effects, self-fertilization, Hill-Robertson interference,
21   background selection, population structure

1

ABSTRACT

The accurate estimation of the distribution of fitness effects (DFE) of new mutations is critical for population genetic inference but remains a challenging task. While various methods have been developed for DFE inference using the site frequency spectrum of putatively neutral and selected sites, their applicability in species with diverse life history traits and complex demographic scenarios is not well understood. Selfing is common among eukaryotic species and can lead to decreased effective recombination rates, increasing the effects of selection at linked sites, including interference between selected alleles. We employ forward simulations to investigate the limitations of current DFE estimation approaches in the presence of selfing and other model violations, such as linkage, departures from semidominance, population structure, and uneven sampling. We find that distortions of the site frequency spectrum due to Hill-Robertson interference in highly selfing populations lead to mis-inference of the deleterious DFE of new mutations. Specifically, when inferring the distribution of selection coefficients, there is an overestimation of nearly neutral and strongly deleterious mutations and an underestimation of mildly deleterious mutations when interference between selected alleles is pervasive. In addition, the presence of cryptic population structure with low rates of migration and uneven sampling across subpopulations leads to the false inference of a deleterious DFE skewed towards effectively neutral/mildly deleterious mutations. Finally, the proportion of adaptive substitutions estimated at high rates of selfing is substantially overestimated. Our observations apply broadly to species and genomic regions with little/no recombination and where interference might be pervasive.

INTRODUCTION

The distribution of fitness effects (DFE) of new mutations describes the continuum of selective effects of spontaneous mutations in a population and is critical for understanding the effects of natural selection on genetic variation (Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2007). Because of the considerable impact deleterious mutations can have on allele frequency patterns in a population, knowledge of the DFE is often necessary to produce accurate evolutionary models, which are required for unbiased estimates of both the demographic history of a population and the proportion of adaptive nucleotide substitutions in a lineage (Charlesworth 1994; Eyre-Walker

2

53 and Keightley 2007; Bank et al. 2014; Johri, Aquadro, et al. 2022). While the DFE can be

54 estimated with experimental approaches using random mutagenesis or mutation-accumulation

55 lines (*e.g.*, Wloch *et al.* 2001; Estes *et al.* 2004; Sanjuán *et al.* 2004), it can also be inferred from

56 the distribution of allele frequencies from population genetic data (Williamson et al. 2005; Eyre-

57 Walker et al. 2006; Keightley and Eyre-Walker 2007; Galtier 2016). As many organisms cannot

58 easily be cultured in laboratories, are not genetically manipulatable, and/or have large generation

59 times, a population genetic approach remains an important and the only possible approach to

60 estimating the DFE in some species.

61 　　　　Population genetic methods use putatively neutral sites to fit the demographic history or

62 to account for other potential nuisance parameters, while selected sites are used to infer the DFE

63 (by inferring the parameters of a prespecified probability distribution), conditional on the

64 demographic history obtained from neutral sites (reviewed in Johri *et al.* 2022b). While most

65 two-step population genetic approaches that infer the DFE make a series of assumptions, like

66 random mating and the absence of effects of selection at linked sites, they appear to be robust to

67 certain model violations like mutation rate variability (Tataru et al. 2017), background selection

68 (Huber et al. 2017; Kim et al. 2017; Huang et al. 2021), population substructure (Kim et al.

69 2017), and some complex demographic changes (Kousathanas and Keightley 2013). This is

70 because two-step inference methods are usually employed using interdigitated neutral and

71 selected sites and might therefore correct for model violations that skew the neutral and selected

72 SFS similarly. As an aside, because demographic history is unlikely to affect the SFS of neutral

73 and very strongly deleterious mutations equally (Eyre-Walker et al. 2006), this might lead to

74 slight inaccuracies in inference using methods that do not explicitly model population size

75 changes.

76 　　　　Despite significant progress, not much work has been done on understanding the effects

77 of non-random mating, in particular self-fertilization, on the inference of the DFE using

78 population genetic approaches. Self-fertilization or selfing (*i.e.*, an individual mating with itself)

79 is common across all eukaryotic species - about 35% of all seed plants and ~50% of all animals

80 exhibit moderate to high rates (50-100%) of selfing (Goodwillie et al. 2005; Jarne and Auld

81 2006). A transition from random mating to partial selfing has several effects on the population.

82 Firstly, the increase of nonrandom mating in a partially selfing population decreases the effective

83 population size (N_e), due to a reduction in the amount of independently sampled gametes (Pollak

84   1987) . There is no change in the probability of fixation of semidominant mutations, but the

85   probability of fixation of recessive or partially recessive beneficial mutations is increased by

86   selfing, and the probability of fixation of recessive or partially recessive deleterious mutations is

87   slightly reduced (Caballero and Hill 1992; Charlesworth 1992). Thirdly, increased homozygosity

88   in the genomes of partially selfing organisms results in a higher proportion of recombination

89   events occurring on nearly identical chromosomes, which decreases the effective rate of

90   recombination (Nordborg 2000). This effect increases the extent of background selection (BGS;

91   Charlesworth *et al.* 1993; Charlesworth and Charlesworth 1998; Charlesworth 2003) and

92   selective sweeps (Hedrick 1980; Hartfield and Bataillon 2020) experienced by the population.

93   Finally, as the effective rate of recombination is lowered drastically in highly selfing

94   populations, there can be a further decrease in the efficacy of selection due to Hill-Robertson

95   interference (HRI) between selected loci (Hill and Robertson 1966; McVean and Charlesworth

96   2000; Comeron and Kreitman 2002; Hartfield and Glémin 2014; Hartfield and Glémin 2016).

97   Hill-Robertson interference (HRI) describes how the efficacy of selection at an allele at

98   one locus can be reduced due to the segregation of selected alleles at a second linked locus (Hill

99   and Robertson 1966; Felsenstein 1974). While BGS and selective sweeps are also a type of HRI,

100 those models assume that selection is strong and that there is no interference between selected

101 sites (reviewed in Charlesworth and Jensen 2021). However, because weakly selected mutations

102 can segregate in the population at higher frequencies, interference between them can result in

103 reduced efficacy of selection and has been termed interference selection (Comeron et al. 1999;

104 Comeron and Kreitman 2002) or weak selection HRI (McVean and Charlesworth 2000; Kaiser

105 and Charlesworth 2009). Moreover, the effects of such interference have been shown to extend

106 to more strongly selected mutations in cases where recombination is greatly reduced (Kaiser and

107 Charlesworth 2009). We therefore refer to the effects of interference selection/weak selection

108 HRI as simply HRI in this study. Since the entire genomes of populations with high selfing rates

109 have greatly reduced effective recombination rates (Nordborg 2000) and deleterious mutations

110 are prevalent across the genome (Bank et al. 2014), HRI is likely to play an important role in

111 determining the dynamics of deleterious mutations in such populations.

112   Unlike the model of classical BGS, where deleterious alleles are at deterministic

113 mutation-selection equilibrium, selected sites in populations or genomic regions with pervasive

114 HRI depart from the standard equilibrium (Comeron and Kreitman 2002; Kaiser and

115   Charlesworth 2009; O'Fallon et al. 2010; Seger et al. 2010; Nicolaisen and Desai 2013). The site

116   frequency spectra (SFS) of neutral and selected sites affected by HRI are skewed towards rare

117   variants and become more similar to each other as the strength of HRI increases, and these

118   changes cannot be summarized as a simple change in effective population size (Comeron and

119   Kreitman 2002; Kaiser and Charlesworth 2009; O'Fallon et al. 2010; Seger et al. 2010;

120   Nicolaisen and Desai 2013; Good et al. 2014). More recent work assuming equal selection

121   coefficients across deleterious alleles has shown that when HRI is sufficiently common, the

122   nucleotide site diversity can be entirely described by the variation of fitness between individuals

123   in the population. However, populations with different combinations of average selection

124   coefficients, recombination, and mutation rates can have the same nucleotide diversity in this

125   regime (Good et al. 2014), suggesting difficulties in estimating a distribution of selection

126   coefficients along with other population genetic parameters in populations with little/no

127   recombination. While, a recent study suggested that the population-scaled fitness effects of

128   mutations are mis-inferred due to linked effects of selection when the probability of selfing is

129   sufficiently high (Gilbert et al. 2022), the role of HRI (specifically interference) remains unclear.

130   Here, we thoroughly characterize how HRI and other linked effects of selection might bias the

131   inference of both population-scaled as well as direct estimates of selection coefficients in highly

132   selfing species and in regions of low recombination for a variety of DFE shapes. To investigate

133   other potential causes of DFE mis-inference in partially selfing natural populations, we explore

134   the effects of changing the dominance coefficients, coding density, and number of selected sites,

135   as well as the effects of cryptic population structure and sampling on DFE inference. Moreover,

136   we characterize the accuracy of inference of both the DFE of new deleterious mutations as well

137   as the proportion of adaptive substitutions.

138

139

140   **METHODS**

141   **Simulations**

142   All simulations were performed using the forward simulator SLiM (version 4.0.1; Haller and

143   Messer 2023). The genome architecture and population parameters were modeled to mimic the

144   genomes of *C. elegans* populations because they have a high rate of selfing, which has been

145   estimated to be 98%-99.9% using laboratory observations (Hodgkin 1983; Anderson et al. 2010),

5

146   field work, and population genetic analyses (Barrière and Félix 2005; Barrière and Félix 2007).

147   A chromosome with an intron-exon structure was simulated such that each gene consisted of 6

148   exons (250 bp in length) and 5 introns (100 bp in length). Genes were interspersed with

149   intergenic regions of length 3000 bp each. These numbers were close to the median of the length

150   of exons, introns, and intergenic regions observed in the *C. elegans* genome with a gene density

151   of ~1 gene every 5kb (*C. elegans* Sequencing Consortium 1998). The *C. elegans* genome

152   comprises 30% coding, 25% intronic, and 45% intergenic regions (*C. elegans* Sequencing

153   Consortium 1998). In line with these genome-wide characteristics, our simulated genome

154   comprised 30% coding, 10% intronic, and 60% intergenic regions, and a total of 500 genes,

155   resulting in a full chromosomal length of 2,503,000 bp. All introns and intergenic regions were

156   assumed to be neutral, while exons experienced selection.

157   To take synonymous sites into account, 25% ($= f_{neu}$) of all mutations in exons were

158   assumed to be fully neutral (with $s=0$) while the rest were under selection. Fitness was calculated

159   multiplicatively across loci. Epistasis, which could increase or decrease HRI due to changes in

160   the mean equilibrium frequency of deleterious mutations, was not modeled in this study. Of the

161   selected mutations, a fraction f_{pos} were assumed to be beneficial, where f_{pos} was assumed to be

162   either 0.0, 0.01, or 0.001, and the rest ($1 - f_{pos} - f_{neu}$) were deleterious. The DFE of deleterious

163   mutations was assumed to be a gamma distribution, parametrized by the shape parameter (β) and

164   the mean population-scaled selection coefficient ($\gamma = 2N_e\overline{s_d}$), where $\overline{s_d}$ is the mean selective

165   disadvantage of the mutant homozygote relative to wildtype. Three different deleterious DFEs

166   were modeled, representing fitness effects skewed towards mildly, moderately, and strongly

167   deleterious classes respectively (Table 1). The DFE of beneficial mutations was assumed to be

168   exponential with mean $2N_e\overline{s_a} = 200$, where $\overline{s_a}$ is the mean selective advantage of the mutant

169   homozygote relative to wildtype. All mutations were assumed to be semidominant (where $h =$

170   0.5) unless otherwise specified.

171   A Wright-Fisher population under equilibrium was simulated with a population size (N)

172   of 500,000 diploid individuals (following Gilbert et al. 2022) and with varying probabilities of

173   selfing – 0%, 50%, 80%, 90%, 95%, and 99%. Mutation (μ) and recombination (r) rates were

174   assumed to be constant at 3.3×10^{-9} per site/generation (Denver et al. 2004; Konrad et al. 2019;

175   Saxena et al. 2019) and 3.12×10^{-8} per site/generation (Rockman and Kruglyak 2009),

176   respectively. Simulations were conducted with a population size of 5000 diploid individuals,

177   with a rescaling factor (Q) of 100, and rates of mutation and recombination as well as selection

178   coefficients were correspondingly adjusted so that the population-scaled parameters $N\mu$, Nr, and

179   Ns were equivalent to a population of 500,000. Simulations were run for a total of $14N$

180   generations, where $10N$ generations corresponded to the burn-in period and $4N$ generations were

181   used to calculate the number of substitutions and where N represents the scaled population size.

182   Five replicates of each evolutionary scenario were simulated and the DFE was estimated for each

183   replicate separately.

184

185   *Single-locus simulations with selfing*: To investigate the effects of selfing on DFE inference

186   without linkage, selected, semidominant mutations were simulated at single sites with

187   probabilities of selfing of 0%, 50%, and 99%. As allele frequencies of neutral mutations are

188   unaffected by linkage in the absence of selected mutations, 187,500 linked neutral sites were

189   simulated, equivalent to the number of neutral sites present in 500 *C. elegans* genes. 50,000

190   selected sites were simulated for each scenario (compared to 562,500 selected sites in previous

191   simulations), then paired with neutral mutations simulated with the appropriate selfing rate. The

192   simulations were rescaled by a factor of 100 and run for $14N$ generations with $10N$ burn-in

193   generations.

194

195   *Simulations under low recombination rates with no selfing*: To clarify if the lower effective

196   recombination rates in a partially selfing population were responsible for DFE mis-inference, we

197   conducted simulations with low recombination rates and 0% selfing. As before, these simulations

198   were rescaled by a factor of 100. The *C. elegans* rescaled recombination rate of 3.12×10^{-6} was

199   multiplied by 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.005, or 0.001. Beneficial mutations were not included in

200   these simulations.

201

202   *Simulations with varying dominance coefficients*: All selected mutations shared a single

203   dominance coefficient of 0.1, 0.25, or 0.75. Populations with selfing probabilities of 0%, 50%,

204   and 99% were simulated and compared to the original simulations (where $h = 0.5$).

205

206   *Simulations under varying coding density and chromosome size*: Simulations were performed

207   with varying coding densities by varying the intergenic lengths - 1500 bp and 500 bp. The total

208   number of genes was not increased in these simulations. Thus, in the simulations with 1500 bp

209   intergenic regions, the simulated genome was comprised of ~43% coding, ~14% intronic, and

210   ~43% intergenic regions, with a total length of 1,752,100 bp. In the simulations with 500 bp

211   intergenic regions, the genome was comprised of ~55% coding, ~18% intronic, and ~27%

212   intergenic regions, with a total length of 1,376,650 bp. These simulations were run with

213   probabilities of selfing equal to 0%, 50%, and 99%.

214   To study the effects of a more realistically sized chromosome on DFE inference in

215   selfers, the total number of genes was increased from 500 to 3000, corresponding to

216   approximately the number of genes observed on the first chromosome of the *C. elegans* genome,

217   with a total simulated length of 15,018,000 bp, close to the true size of *C. elegans* chromosome I

218   (15,072,434 bp) (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/datasets/genome/GCF_000002985.6/; last

219   accessed in Dec. 2023).

220

221   *Simulations with varying rescaling factors:* To investigate the impact of rescaling of population

222   sizes, simulations were conducted with the rescaling factor $Q = 50$, 20, and 10, where the

223   population-scaled parameters $N\mu$, Nr, and Ns were equivalent to a population of 500,000.

224   Simulations were run for a total of $14N$ generations, where $10N$ generations corresponded to the

225   burn-in period and $4N$ generations were used to calculate the number of substitutions and where

226   N represents the scaled population size. Due to the excessive run time of unscaled simulations,

227   simulations were only run with selfing rates of 95% and 99%. For $Q = 10$, only one replicate of

228   DFE3 at 95% selfing and three replicates each for DFE2 and DFE3 at 99% selfing reached

229   completion.

230

Quantifying the effect of BGS in simulated data

232   To determine the theoretically expected neutral nucleotide diversity (π) in simulations with

233   partial selfing, we calculated the expected effective population size after correcting for selfing

234   (N_{self}) as $N_{self} = N/(1 + F)$, where $F = P_{self}/(2 - P_{self})$, and P_{self} represents the proportion

235   of selfing individuals in a population per generation (Pollak 1987). Without the linked effects of

236   selection, the neutral π is expected to be approximated by $\pi \sim \theta = 4N_{self}\mu$. In simulations with

237   deleterious mutations, the extent of BGS was quantified as the observed nucleotide diversity

238   (π_{obs}) at neutral sites relative to that expected under strict neutrality, *i.e.*,

239

$$B = \frac{\pi_{obs}}{4N_{self}\mu} \tag{1}$$

241

Simulations with population structure

To study the effects of population structure on DFE inference in selfers, a finite island model (Maruyama 1970) with five demes and an equal probability of exchange of migrants between all demes was considered. Note that in this model the migration rate is independent of the selfing rate, which applies well to animals but is not necessarily the case in plant species because selfing can prevent pollen dispersal (reviewed in Sicard and Lenhard 2011). Scenarios with different migration rates were simulated such that the effective metapopulation size remained constant and equivalent to the size of the panmictic population simulated above. Genome structure was identical to that in the previous simulations mimicking *C. elegans* genome architecture. In a metapopulation with d demes and a deme effective population size N_{deme}, the mean coalescence time for a pair of alleles sampled from the same deme (T_S) is given by the following equation (Nei 1973; Slatkin and Voelm 1991; Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2010):

$$T_S \sim 2dN_{deme} \tag{2}$$

The mean coalescence time for a pair of alleles sampled from different demes (T_B) is given by (Nei 1973; Slatkin and Voelm 1991; Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2010):

$$T_B \sim 2dN_{deme} + \frac{(d-1)}{2m} \tag{3}$$

where the migration rate m is the probability that an allele in one deme is derived by migration from any other deme in a generation (which means that the migration rate between any two demes is equal to $\frac{m}{d}$). Combining these two equations gives the mean coalescence time (T_T) for a

9

267 pair of alleles drawn from the entire metapopulation (Nei 1973; Slatkin and Voelm 1991;

268 Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2010):

269

270
$$T_T \sim 2dN_{deme} + \frac{(d-1)^2}{2dm}$$
(4)

271

272

273 To keep the effective size of the metapopulation ($0.5T_T$) equivalent to the rescaled size of

274 5,000 individuals used in previous simulations, N_{deme} and m were varied such that T_T remained

275 equal to 10,000. To allow a wide range of migration rates, $N_{deme}m$ was varied from 10, 2, 1, 0.5,

276 and 0.1 in populations with 0%, 50%, and 99% selfing, with separate simulations for DFE1,

277 DFE2, and DFE3. The exact parameters used in each simulation can be found in Supplementary

278 Table 7. Parameters were chosen so that the predicted F_{ST} of the entire metapopulation ($F_{ST} =$

279 $\frac{T_T - T_S}{T_T}$) would cover a range of values (from 0.02 to 0.76) matching previously estimated values

280 for *C. elegans* populations in the literature (from 0.15 to 0.43; Cutter 2006). Neutral simulations

281 with identical genome structure and migration parameters were used to verify the joint effects of

282 population structure and selfing on neutral nucleotide diversity and F_{ST}, and were found to yield

283 expected results (Supplementary Table 8). The expected neutral nucleotide diversity for partially

284 selfing populations was calculated assuming that the effective size of each deme will be

285 equivalent to $N_{deme,self} = \frac{N_{deme}}{1+F}$, which was used to calculate the appropriate T_T and T_S values

286 for each evolutionary scenario. In SLiM, m represents the proportion of individuals in a deme

287 that are migrants each generation. Therefore, m still represents the probability that an allele is

288 derived from migration each generation, and $N_{deme}m$ represents the number of diploid migrants

289 per deme per generation.

290 Twenty genomes were sampled from each deme (totaling 100 genomes from the

291 metapopulation) for DFE inference. To understand the effects of uneven sampling on DFE

292 inference, two alternative sampling schemes were employed. In the first, 60 genomes were

293 sampled from one deme, while 10 genomes were drawn from the remaining four demes. In the

294 second, 35 genomes were drawn from two demes, while 10 genomes were drawn from the

295 remaining three demes.

296

Calculating the SFS and the number of adaptive substitutions from simulations

The full output provided by SLiM was used to generate the site frequency spectra of neutral and selected mutations in exonic regions individually. The fixed class was obtained as the number of substitutions that occurred after the burn-in period ($= 10N$ generations). The zero class was calculated by subtracting the number of polymorphic and fixed sites from the total number of sites for both neutral ($= 0.25 \times$ number of exonic sites) and selected ($= 0.75 \times$ number of exonic sites) mutations respectively. Scripts to calculate the SFS are available at https://github.com/JohriLab/DFESelfing/tree/main/calculateSFS.

The true fraction of beneficial substitutions (α) in simulations was obtained as follows:

$$\alpha = \frac{number\ of\ substitutions\ with\ 2N_e s_a > 5}{number\ of\ substitutions\ at\ selected\ sites} \tag{5}$$

Only substitutions that occurred after the burn-in with $2N_e s_a > 5$ were included when calculating the true value of α in order to match the assumptions of GRAPES.

DFE-alpha

Est_dfe (Keightley and Eyre-Walker 2007) was employed to infer the DFE of deleterious mutations. We fitted a two-epoch model, with starting values of $t2$ (time of change), β, and $\overline{s_d}$ equal to 50, 0.5, and -0.01 respectively. $N2$ (current size) and $t2$ were set to be variable. In the absence of positive selection, the unfolded SFS was used as input, and the fold setting was set to 0. In the presence of beneficial mutations, the folded SFS was used in addition to the unfolded SFS because DFE-alpha has been shown to be sensitive to high frequency beneficial alleles in the SFS (Tataru et al. 2017). DFE-alpha provides the most likely estimate of the expected value of $\overline{s_d}$, the shape parameter (β) of the gamma distribution, and a weighted effective population size (N_w). These parameters were used to obtain the proportion of mutations (f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3) in the four classes- effectively neutral ($0 \leq 2N_w s_d < 1$), weakly deleterious ($1 \leq 2N_w s_d < 10$), moderately deleterious ($10 \leq 2N_w s_d < 100$), and strongly deleterious ($100 \leq 2N_w s_d$), respectively.

11

GRAPES

The program GRAPES (Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2009; Galtier 2016), Version 1.1.1 (https://github.com/BioPP/grapes/releases/tag/v1.1.1) was used to infer the full DFE using simulations with and without positive selection. GRAPES provides the maximum likelihood estimate of the shape parameter (β) and the expected population-scaled mean strength of selection in terms of $2N_e \overline{s_d}$, in order to characterize the gamma distribution representing the deleterious DFE. GRAPES also infers the parameters of the beneficial DFE, including the proportion of substitutions that are beneficial mutations (α) and the mean population-scaled strength of selection favoring new advantageous mutations $2N_e \overline{s_a}$, assuming that advantageous selection coefficients are exponentially distributed. The unfolded SFS was provided as input for both scenarios (with and without positive selection). In simulations without positive selection, the default parameters for the GammaZero model were used (*i.e.*, parameters of the beneficial DFE were not inferred). In the presence of positive selection, the estimated beneficial DFE was assumed to follow an exponential distribution (*i.e.*, the GammaExpo model was used). As GRAPES can use either the folded or the unfolded SFS to provide estimates of the beneficial DFE, we performed inference using the unfolded and folded SFS separately to compare the results of both estimation methods. These parameters were accordingly used to obtain the values f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3, representing the classes of the deleterious DFE as described above.

Comparison of the expected and estimated DFE when mutations are semidominant

In a partially selfing population, diffusion theory provides the following mean ($M_{\Delta q}$) and variance ($V_{\Delta q}$) of the change in allele frequency (q) assuming that the change (Δq) in allele frequency is small (Caballero et al. 1991):

$$M_{\Delta q} = q(1-q)s[h + q(1-2h) + F(1-q-h+2qh)] \tag{6}$$

$$V_{\Delta q} = \frac{q(1-q)}{2N_{self}} = \frac{q(1-q)(1+F)}{2N} \tag{7}$$

12

357

358   For completely additive mutations ($h = 0.5$), the mean reduces to:

359

$$M_{\Delta q} = \frac{q(1-q)s(1+F)}{2} \qquad (8)$$

361

362

363   In a panmictic population (of size N) with random mating, the mean and variance of change in

364   allele frequency (assuming semidominance) is given by:

365

$$M_{\Delta q} = \frac{q(1-q)s}{2} \qquad (9)$$

367

368

$$V_{\Delta q} = \frac{q(1-q)}{2N} \qquad (10)$$

370

371

372   Thus, by comparing the above set of equations, a selfing population of size N experiences more

373   genetic drift than a randomly mating population of the same size (Caballero and Hill 1992).

374   However, the mean change in allele frequency in selfing populations is also larger, by the same

375   factor, $(1 + F)$, and thus the fixation probability of mutations remains the same in a selfing *vs*. a

376   randomly mating population (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 1987; Caballero and Hill 1992;

377   Charlesworth 1992). Thus, for the case of additive mutations and not taking selection at linked

378   sites into account, the expected DFE would be determined by $2N_{self}s_d(1 + F) =$

379     $2\frac{N}{(1+F)}s_d(1 + F) = 2Ns_d$. To account for the relative decrease in population size due to BGS

380   or selective sweeps, the simulated DFE was adjusted and presented as $2NBs_d$, where B was

381   calculated using equation 1.

382   In the case of the estimated DFE, because DFE-alpha only infers a relative increase or

383   decrease in population size ($\frac{N_2}{N_1}$), these estimates of demographic parameters should not be

384   affected by selfing rates (where the factor $1 + F$ will cancel out). We thus present our inferred

385   DFE as $2N_w s_d$.

386

387   **Comparison of the expected and estimated DFE when mutations are not semidominant**

388   When mutations were not additive, our expected DFE was parameterized by $2N_{self} s_d h_{self}$,

389   where

390

391
$$N_{self} = \frac{N}{1 + F} \tag{11}$$

392

393

394   and

395
$$h_{self} = h + q(1 - 2h) + F(1 - q - h + 2qh) \tag{12}$$

396

397

398   Assuming that $q \ll 1$, this equation simplifies to:

399

400
$$h_{self} \sim h + F(1 - h) \tag{13}$$

401

402   Note that this approximation is less accurate when selection is weak ($2Ns_d \sim 1$) and thus might

403   not be as accurate for the DFE comprising predominantly weakly deleterious mutations. The

404   estimated DFE (using DFE-alpha and GRAPES) was parameterized by $2N_w s_d h$ where $h = 0.5$

405   is assumed by both the programs.

406

407   **Calculation of summary statistics from simulated data**

408   In order to quantify the effects of HRI, the skew in the SFS towards rare alleles was measured

409   using the summary statistic $\Delta\theta_w = 1 - (\frac{\pi}{\theta_w})$, which has been demonstrated to be less sensitive

410   than Tajima's D to the number of SNPs used in the calculation (Becher et al. 2020). Here, π is

411   the nucleotide diversity (Nei and Tajima 1981) and θ_w denotes Watterson's θ (Watterson 1975).

412   In addition, the number of singletons ($sing$) and haplotype diversity (hapdiv; Ferrer-Admetlla et

413   al. 2014) were calculated. To summarize linkage disequilibrium, r^2 (Hill and Robertson 1968),

14

414 D, and D' (Lewontin 1964) were calculated using minor alleles for pairs of polymorphisms at

415 frequencies between 1% and 5%. Only low-frequency SNPs were used for D' calculations to

416 correct for the allele frequency dependence of linkage disequilibrium statistics (Lewontin 1988).

417 All summary statistics were calculated separately for neutral and selected polymorphisms in

418 exonic regions in nonoverlapping 5000 bp windows using *pylibseq* v. 0.2.3 (Thornton 2003).

419

420 **Estimation of the extent of background selection in highly selfing species**

421 To estimate the levels of background selection (B) in highly selfing species, we collated previous

422 estimates for the mutation (μ) and recombination rate (r) per site/generation, the fraction of the

423 genome that is coding (f_{coding}), and selfing rates for highly selfing species that have publicly

424 available genome assemblies. In species where the mutation rate had not been measured, we used

425 closely-related species to approximate the rate (see Supplementary Table 9 for details). Estimates

426 of B were obtained for each species using $B = \exp\left(-\frac{U_d}{R_{self}}\right)$ (Nordborg *et. al* 1996), where U_d

427 (the genome-wide mutation rate for a diploid individual) was estimated as $U_d =$

428 $2 \times L \times f_{coding} * \mu \times 0.7$, where L is the total length of the genome, 0.7 represents the fraction

429 of nonsynonymous sites, and $R_{self} = R \times F$, where R was estimated as $R = r \times L$.

430

431

432 **RESULTS**

433 **Inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations in self-fertilizing populations**

434 We simulated a single *C. elegans*-like population with varying rates of selfing – 0, 50, 80, 90, 95,

435 and 99% and three different DFEs (following a gamma distribution; parameters specified in

436 Table 1) skewed towards mildly (DFE1), moderately (DFE2), and strongly deleterious (DFE3)

437 classes respectively. Here we assumed that all new mutations were semidominant. We used

438 DFE-alpha and GRAPES to infer the parameters of the deleterious DFE, specified to be gamma-

439 distributed. As expected, when there is no selfing, inference was accurate (Figure1,

440 Supplementary Figure 1, Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). As the selfing rate

441 increased ($\geq 90\%$), the estimated DFE (*i.e.*, distribution of population-scaled selection

442 coefficients) was skewed strongly towards the class of mildly deleterious mutations (Figure 1),

443 when compared to the simulated DFE, with a particularly substantial skew in the most highly

15

444   selfing population, consistent with Gilbert *et al.* (2022). While the inferred $2N\bar{s}_d$ was highly

445   underestimated (Supplementary Figure 1)., the β parameter of the gamma distribution was also

446   mis-inferred as the selfing rate increased, with the inferred β becoming 2-3× smaller than the

447   simulated value at 99% selfing (Supplementary Table 2). The mean population-scaled selection

448   coefficients remained slightly biased even when selfing rates were as low as 80% (*e.g.* for DFE2;

449   Figure 1, Supplementary Table 2).

450   Because BGS will lead to a decrease in the effective population size, we hypothesized

451   that the true population-scaled selection coefficients in our simulated populations are likely to be

452   smaller than those simulated (*i.e.*, $2Ns_d$). To account for the reduction in the efficacy of

453   purifying selection due to BGS, we corrected the simulated DFE with the relative rate of

454   coalescence (B) with and without BGS observed in the simulated population. Note that this

455   adjusted DFE accounts for the relative decrease in population size due to linked effects of

456   selection only, not due to selfing (see details in Methods). While the inferred DFE matches the

457   corrected expected DFE substantially well for moderate levels of selfing (Figure 1;

458   Supplementary Figure 1), the DFE accounting for BGS is somewhat inaccurate at high selfing

459   levels (Figure 1C; Supplementary Figure 1).

460   We next estimated the distribution of selection coefficients by accounting for the

461   decrease in the effective population size due to BGS. Consistent with the observation above, the

462   distribution of selection coefficients is accurately inferred when selfing rates are below 0.8

463   (Supplementary Figure 2) but remains inaccurate at extremely high selfing rates (0.95-0.99;

464   Figure 1D; Supplementary Figure 2). That is, the inferred DFE (in terms of the selection

465   coefficients) tends to have both more strongly deleterious mutations and nearly neutral mutations

466   and results in a more platykurtic than the simulated distribution (Figure 1D; Supplementary

467   Figure 2). This suggests that a simple rescaling of the effective population size can correct for

468   the misinference when selfing rates are low/moderate (when the population is likely experiencing

469   classical BGS) but not when rates are high (when the population is likely in the interference

470   selection regime). This effect is especially substantial when a higher proportion of the DFE is

471   composed of weakly and moderately deleterious mutations (*e.g.* DFE1 and DFE2), which are

472   more likely to experience HRI(Figure 1D; Supplementary Figure 2).

473

474   The simulated DFEs were accurately estimated from single-locus simulations with no linkage

475   even in highly selfing populations (Supplementary Figure 3), despite a significant reduction in

476   the total number of segregating sites at high selfing (Supplementary Table 3). Concordantly, the

477   observed SFSs at selected and neutral sites were highly similar across different selfing levels,

478   confirming that selfing does not drastically influence the proportions of allele frequencies in a

479   population without linkage (Supplementary Figure 4), assuming that deleterious mutations are

480   additive. Importantly, as high rates of selfing increase the levels of homozygosity, the site

481   frequency spectrum (SFS) obtained from a random sample of diploid *individuals* deviated starkly

482   from one obtained by a random sampling of *genomes* (an example shown in Supplementary

483   Figure 5A). The inferred DFEs were very similar when we sampled individuals *vs*. genomes

484   (Supplementary Figure 5B) and thus all results that follow were obtained by sampling genomes.

485

486

487   **The effects of linkage on DFE inference in regions of low recombination**

488   HRI is more likely in genomic regions of low recombination and may similarly bias DFE

489   inference. With decreasing rates of recombination, the extent of mis-inference of the DFE

490   increased (Figure 2A, B). As before, while the DFE accounting for BGS explained the estimated

491   DFEs quite well for higher recombination rates, at very low recombination rates, it did not match

492   the inferred DFE (Figure 2C). The inferred distribution of selection coefficients tended to

493   overestimate the proportion of strongly deleterious and nearly neutral mutations and

494   underestimated the proportion of mildly deleterious mutations (Figure 2D; Supplementary Figure

495   6). As with high selfing, the estimated distribution of selection coefficients at low recombination

496   was observed to be more platykurtic than that simulated, and mis-inference was much stronger at

497   the lowest recombination rates, even for the most strongly deleterious DFE (Supplementary

498   Figure 7). This again reflects the fact that a simple rescaling effect of BGS (*i.e.*, the decrease in

499   the rate of coalescence) is unlikely to explain mis-inference observed in regions of very low

500   recombination due to HRI. Note that the relative decrease in nucleotide diversity ($B = \frac{\pi}{\pi_0}$) due to

501   background selection, measured in simulations of regions with low recombination ($B\sim0.05 - $

502   0.92) captured the range of B values measured in the simulations with selfing and linkage

503   ($B\sim0.08 - 0.95$).

504

17

505 **Parameters that modulate the extent of HRI**

506 Population-scaled parameters such as NU, NR, and Ns all influence the extent of interference

507 between selected alleles (Good et al. 2014). When the ratio of mutation to recombination is

508 sufficiently high and the strength of purifying selection is low, interference between selected

509 mutations becomes sufficiently common to cause them to diverge from the predictions of single

510 site models. To investigate whether these parameters similarly determine the extent of DFE

511 misinference, we explored how $\frac{U_d}{R}$ and $\frac{U_d}{R_{self}}$ relates to the degree of misinference of s and β

512 (Figure 3A) in the simulations with low recombination and selfing respectively, where U_d is the

513 genome-wide deleterious mutation rate, R is the map length of the simulated chromosome

514 (assuming that recombination scales linearly with distance), and $R_{self} = R \times (1 - F)$, where

515 $F = P_{self}/(2 - P_{self})$ (Nordborg 2000). We found that error is relatively small at low $\frac{U_d}{R}$ ratios,

516 but when $\frac{U_d}{R}$ is greater than ~5, error began to rapidly increase, with the largest error present in

517 the DFE with predominantly weakly deleterious mutations. Interestingly, we found that the

518 extent of BGS, as measured by B, was by itself a good predictor of the extent of this error,

519 finding that as B decreased, the error in both $\bar{s}_d$ and β increased, and that the relationship

520 between B and error was very similar in the low recombination and selfing simulations (Figure

521 3B). Although this might help determine when inference could be biased, it is difficult to obtain

522 true values of B from empirical data especially if the genome-wide rate of recombination is low.

523

524 **The quantification of HRI using summary statistics**

525 Much theoretical and computational work on HRI has suggested that the decrease in the efficacy

526 of selection results in a decrease in the nucleotide diversity at selected and linked neutral sites as

527 well as an increase in divergence at selected sites due to the increased fixation of deleterious

528 mutations (Comeron et al. 1999; McVean and Charlesworth 2000). Moreover, the site frequency

529 spectrum for selected and neutral sites is expected to be skewed towards low-frequency variants

530 as the strength of BGS and HRI increases (mimicking the genealogy of an expanding population;

531 Zeng and Charlesworth 2011; Walczak *et al.* 2012; Nicolaisen and Desai 2013; Good *et al.*

532 2014), and the nucleotide diversity and site frequency spectrum of selected mutations are

533 expected to become more similar to those of neutral mutations (Comeron and Kreitman 2002;

534 Kaiser and Charlesworth 2009; O'Fallon et al. 2010; Seger et al. 2010; Nicolaisen and Desai

18

535   2013). Because interference results in a gene genealogy with longer external branches than

536   expected under a standard neutral coalescent (Walczak *et al.* 2012; Nicolaisen and Desai 2013),

537   and consistent with a skew towards low-frequency alleles, new mutations are more likely to

538   occur on separate branches of the genealogy, generating negative LD. Thus signed measures of

539   linkage disequilibrium between selected mutations and nearby neutral sequences become more

540   negative as HRI becomes stronger (Hill and Robertson 1966; McVean and Charlesworth 2000;

541   Comeron and Kreitman 2002; Garcia and Lohmueller 2021). In addition, in populations with

542   pervasive HRI, the SFS has been observed to show non-monotonic behavior at high frequencies,

543   resulting in a U-shape, which deviates from the predictions of the classical BGS theory (Seger et

544   al. 2010; Neher and Hallatschek 2013; Good et al. 2014; Zeng and Corcoran 2015; Cvijović et al.

545   2018).

546   In our simulations, the SFSs of neutral and selected sites shifted towards lower frequency

547   mutations and became more similar at 90% selfing and above (Figure 4A, Supplementary

548   Figures 8A & 9A), which is consistent with the extent of DFE mis-inference and with previously

549   simulated results in highly selfing populations (Charlesworth *et al.* 1993). In addition, the SFS at

550   high frequency alleles showed non-monotonic (U-shaped) behavior (Figure 4B, Supplementary

551   Figures 8B & 9B). Note that the SFS of neutral sites at 0% selfing was very similar to the

552   unlinked neutral SFS (Supplementary Figure 4), consistent with high B values. Trends in $\Delta\theta_w$, a

553   measure of the skewness of the SFS (with positive values indicating a relative increase in rare

554   alleles), were concordant with the patterns in the SFSs, with $\Delta\theta_w$ values for neutral and selected

555   sites sharply increasing and converging towards each other at 90% selfing and above (Figure 5).

556   Values of $\Delta\theta_w$ at neutral sites nearly converge with values at selected sites at 99% selfing,

557   reflecting the reduced efficacy of selection and almost complete linkage. Similar patterns were

558   observed in the simulations with low recombination, with values of $\Delta\theta_w$ increasing sharply and

559   converging at low recombination rates (Supplementary Figure 10).

560   For selfing rates between 80% and 95%, D' tended to become closer to 0 at both selected

561   and neutral sites (Figure 4B). This is similar to an effect observed in simulations by Kamran-

562   Disfani and Agarwal (2014), where partially selfing populations with intermediate selfing rates

563   showed increases in linkage disequilibria. This phenomenon is expected at higher selfing levels

564   if the efficacy of selection is not overwhelmed by HRI, because of correlations in homozygosity

565   at different loci across the genome (Roze and Lenormand 2005). In contrast, D' remained

19

566   relatively flat for simulations with intermediate recombination rates (Supplementary Figure 10).

567   At 99% selfing and at very low recombination rates, D' values became considerably more

568   negative for selected and neutral sites, consistent with a population experiencing pervasive HRI.

569   To understand how common summary statistics relate to errors in DFE misinference, we

570   investigated how nucleotide diversity (π), θ_H (Fay and Wu 2000) , singleton density ($sing$),

571   haplotype diversity ($hapdiv$), and two LD statistics (r^2 and D) compared with the errors ($\varepsilon =$

572    $\left|\frac{inferred-true}{true}\right|$) of the inferred parameters of the DFE ($2N\bar{s}_d$ and β). In general, we found that

573   SFS-based statistics as well as $hapdiv$ at nonsynonymous sites divided by synonymous sites

574   positively correlated with error in DFE inference (Supplementary Figure 11). On the other hand,

575   LD-based statistics were not found to be particularly informative of the extent of misinference.

576   However, we found that the values for each statistic vary depending on the DFE, suggesting that

577   the value of any one summary statistic cannot be used to determine if pervasive interference is

578   occurring in a population. Moreover, other factors such as assumptions about the fitness model,

579   epistasis, and non-equilibrium demography will also affect the LD statistics (discussed in Johri

580   and Charlesworth 2024), masking the effect of HRI.

581

582   **Simulation rescaling alters the effects of HRI**

583   Due to computational time constraints, it was necessary to rescale the parameters $N\mu$, Nr, and

584   Ns for most simulations in this study by lowering N and increasing μ, r, and s by the rescaling

585   factor $Q = 100$. While equivalent equilibria are expected according to diffusion theory if the

586   population-scaled parameters are held constant (Hill and Robertson 1966; Crow and Kimura, M.

587   1970; Ewens 1979; Li 1987), it has previously been observed that high levels of rescaling can

588   increase the effects of HRI (Comeron and Kreitman 2002). To understand the effects of rescaling

589   at high selfing rates, we once again simulated *C. elegans*-like populations with 500 genes and

590   selfing rates of 95% and 99% and the three deleterious DFEs, with $Q = 50$, 20, and 10, though

591   at $Q = 10$ only a limited number of simulations were able to be completed within a reasonable

592   timeframe. We find that as Q decreases from the original value of 100, the effects of background

593   selection and HRI decrease (Supplementary Figure 12). While the extent of DFE mis-inference

594   decreases as Q is lowered, the DFEs estimated at low Q values and 99% selfing were still mis-

595   inferred, especially the DFEs with more weakly and moderately deleterious mutations. The SFS

596   at higher selfing rates and low Q was still skewed towards lower frequency mutations and U-

597   shaped, though less than at high Q (Supplementary Figures 13-14). Thus, it is likely that fully

598   unscaled simulations ($Q = 1$) would have even less HRI effects, especially for the strongly

599   deleterious DFE, though it is not unrealistic to expect significant effects of BGS and interference

600   between selected mutations based on the trends observed here. For instance, we observed

601   substantially more mis-inference of the DFE when larger genomic regions were simulated

602   (Supplementary Figure 15), suggesting that full length chromosomes simulated at $Q = 1$ will

603   likely have more pervasive linked effects of selection. Indeed, Gilbert *et al.* (2022) conducted

604   unscaled simulations of the entire genome, including all full-length chromosomes and a reduced

605   recombination rate in chromosome centers, with *C. elegans*-like parameters and found a drastic

606   decrease in population size due to background selection (see figure 4 of Gilbert *et al.*), so

607   exploration of our scaled simulations with pervasive HRI is still relevant to highly selfing

608   populations.

609

610   **Extent of mis-inference does not depend on coding density**

611   The effects of HRI are expected to increase when there is a higher density of selected sites, and

612   gene density varies along the *C. elegans* chromosomes, with higher gene densities found in the

613   chromosome centers than in the chromosome arms (*C. elegans* Sequencing Consortium 1998).

614   Moreover, the rate of recombination in *C. elegans* is higher in the gene-poor chromosome arms

615   than in the gene-rich cores (Rockman and Kruglyak 2009). We however observed no obvious

616   changes in the extent of DFE inference when coding density was 2× and 6× higher

617   (Supplementary Figure 16), although local gene densities could increase more than we simulated.

618

619

620   **The impact of dominance on DFE inference**

621   Dominance coefficients of new deleterious mutations vary considerably and are partially

622   recessive on average, with strongly deleterious mutations tending to be highly recessive

623   (Simmons and Crow 1977; Agrawal and Whitlock 2011; Manna et al. 2011). Most DFE

624   inference methods assume that new mutations are semidominant and thus provide estimates of

625   the joint distribution of the selection and dominance coefficients, "$s_d h$". A recent study by Wade

626   *et al.* (2023) suggests that, if there are recessive lethal mutations, current DFE inference

627   approaches can lead to underestimating the true proportion of strongly deleterious mutations, as

21

628   more strongly deleterious mutations are likely to persist in the population if they are recessive.

629   Furthermore, since selfing increases the levels of homozygosity in the genome, the efficacy of

630   selection against large effect and highly recessive deleterious mutations is expected to be greater

631   (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 1998), leading to more efficient purging of deleterious

632   mutations. Thus, with higher rates of selfing one might instead expect to observe a decrease in

633   the allele frequencies of mildly and moderately deleterious mutations, leading to the false

634   inference of the presence of more strongly deleterious mutations in the population.

635   At 0% selfing, as new deleterious mutations became more recessive (especially when

636    $h = 0.1$), the inferred distribution of the population-scaled product of selection and dominance

637   coefficients slightly underestimated the proportion of strongly deleterious mutations

638   (Supplementary Figure 17, Supplementary Table 5), consistent with Wade *et al.* (2023).

639   Additionally, the frequency of the nearly neutral class of mutations was underestimated in all

640   three DFEs. In contrast, when more dominant mutations were simulated, DFE inference resulted

641   in mis-inference towards both weakly and strongly deleterious mutations, though this effect was

642   fairly small. Mis-inference was stronger when the true DFE was skewed towards mildly

643   deleterious mutations, as these mutations are more likely to be present as homozygotes in the

644   population.

645   As selfing increases homozygosity, the dominance coefficient is a less important factor

646   for the efficacy of selection in highly selfing populations (Caballero and Hill 1992; Charlesworth

647   1992). Thus, at 50% selfing, the DFE was inferred more accurately (Supplementary Figure 18,

648   Supplementary Table 5) and the dominance coefficient played a negligible role in DFE inference

649   when the selfing rate was 99% (Supplementary Figure 17). Thus, at high rates of selfing, HRI

650   effects were found to be primarily responsible for DFE mis-inference.

651   Increased purging of recessive deleterious mutations has been hypothesized to reduce

652   their average allele frequencies, leading to DFE mis-inference (Arunkumar et al. 2015; Gilbert et

653   al. 2022). However, observable effects of purging are likely to occur only when mutations are

654   highly recessive (Nei 1968) and strongly deleterious (Glémin 2003). Concordantly, we observed

655   that the distribution of allele frequencies of partially recessive ($h = 0.25$) mutations at

656   intermediate selfing levels was the same as those of semidominant mutations (Supplementary

657   Figure 19), suggesting that increased purging of recessive deleterious alleles did not have a

658   substantial effect on the average allele frequencies in a population sample at equilibrium.

22

659

Inference of the full DFE of new deleterious and beneficial mutations

Both BGS and HRI lead to a decrease in the efficacy of selection at linked selected sites, thus reducing the probability of fixation of beneficial mutations while increasing the probability of fixation of deleterious mutations (Charlesworth 1992; Kamran-Disfani and Agrawal 2014). It is therefore likely that the proportion of fixed mutations at selected sites that are beneficial (α) is mis-estimated when effective recombination rates are low. We conducted simulations with selfing, where 0.1% and 1% of new mutations in exons were beneficial, following an exponential distribution with $2N\overline{s_a} = 200$. Due to recurrent selective sweeps in this scenario as well as BGS, there is likely to be a substantial decrease in effective population size experienced by selected alleles (and thus a reduced $2N_e s_d$). Concordantly, the population-scaled selection coefficients of deleterious mutations were estimated to be heavily skewed towards mildly deleterious mutations even at much lower selfing rates (Supplementary Figures 20 and 21). When 0.1% of new exonic mutations were beneficial, and selfing rates were above 90%, the estimated distributions of selection coefficients were biased towards higher proportions of nearly neutral and strongly deleterious mutations, as observed previously (Figure 6A). However, the inferred distributions were skewed more towards strongly deleterious mutations compared to the simulations with only deleterious mutations. Mis-inference of selection coefficients was particularly substantial when the simulated deleterious DFE consisted of more weakly deleterious mutations, suggesting that HRI effects might cause mis-inference even at moderate levels of selfing if beneficial mutations are reasonably prevalent. The selected SFSs resembled the neutral SFSs in simulations with DFE mis-inference (Supplementary Figure 22). With a high rate of beneficial mutations entering the population, hitchhiking can reduce the efficacy of selection on weakly deleterious alleles (Campos and Charlesworth 2019), leading to the mis-inference of the DFE for the more weakly deleterious DFEs. In addition, the failure of DFE inference programs to fully correct for the presence of mildly beneficial alleles in the SFS could also have contributed to the observed mis-inference (Tataru et al. 2017).

As the folded SFS might provide better estimates of the deleterious DFE when beneficial mutations are segregating at high frequencies (Keightley and Eyre-Walker 2007; Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2009), we also tested the inference using the folded SFS. Overall, the deleterious DFE inferred by GRAPES was comparable when using the unfolded and folded SFS

690   (Supplementary Figures 23A & 24A). However, the DFEs estimated by DFE-alpha using the

691   folded SFS were biased towards weakly deleterious mutations even with no selfing, with much

692   larger uncertainty in the estimated DFE at high selfing levels, especially when 1% of all new

693   selected mutations were beneficial. This indicates that folding the SFS is inadequate to correct

694   for the mis-inference of the deleterious DFE when the rate of new beneficial mutations is

695   extremely high.

696   As expected, the true fraction of beneficial substitutions (α) decreased as the selfing rate

697   increased (Figure 6B, Supplementary Figure 20B). Changes in this parameter were driven by

698   both increases in the number of deleterious substitutions ($\sim 2 - 4 \times$ higher at 99% selfing

699   relative to 0% selfing) as well as the decreases in the number of beneficial substitutions ($\sim 3 \times$

700   lower at 99% selfing relative to 0% selfing; Supplementary Table 6). In simulations with both

701   0.1% beneficial mutations and 1% beneficial mutations, α tended to be overestimated for the

702   weakly deleterious DFE at all selfing levels, with mis-inference increasing steadily as the selfing

703   rate increased. For the moderately and strongly deleterious DFEs, α was only overestimated at

704   high selfing levels, with the strongly deleterious DFE corresponding with the most accurate

705   inference of α. This is consistent with the expectation that a decrease in the efficacy of selection

706   will increase the fixation of weakly deleterious alleles, which will be misinterpreted as beneficial

707   fixations by GRAPES, leading to an overestimation of α at high selfing levels. Very similar

708   trends were observed when the folded SFS was used to estimate α (Supplementary Figures 23B

709   & 24B). Overall, at high selfing levels, α values were substantially overestimated by GRAPES.

710

711   **Effects of population structure and sampling on the accuracy of inference**

712   While selfing organisms tend to have highly structured populations, DFE inference in the context

713   of population structure has been largely unexplored, though the effects of cryptic structure

714   (without migration) were tested in Kim *et al.* (2017). Here, we simulated an island model, with

715   five demes that exchanged migrants at a total rate m each generation. Multiple values of m were

716   used to vary the degree of isolation between demes in this model, and the number of individuals

717   in each deme (N_{deme}) was varied so that the effective size of the metapopulation (N_{meta}) was

718   equivalent to 500,000 individuals (Supplementary Table 7). Under strict neutrality and while

719   selfing was taken into account (see Methods), the neutral nucleotide diversity of the entire

24

720   metapopulation ($2T_T\mu$), of individual subpopulations ($2T_S\mu$), and F_{ST} was equal to theoretical

721   expectations (equations 2-4, Supplementary Table 8).

722   Population structure by itself did not result in mis-inference of the DFE when the rate of

723   migration was sufficiently high (*i.e.*, $N_{deme}m = 2, 1$, and 0.5). High selfing rates with

724   population structure again led to inferring a DFE (as population-scaled selection coefficients)

725   skewed almost entirely towards mildly deleterious mutations, thus producing a very similar

726   extent of mis-inference as that observed in a panmictic population (Supplementary Figure 25 A,

727   B, and C, respectively). However, at low rates of migration between demes ($N_{deme}m$ of 0.1), the

728   DFE was mis-inferred even at 0% selfing, with a bias towards inferring a lower efficacy of

729   selection than the simulated DFE (Figure 7; Supplementary Figure 25D). This was largely

730   because the relative increase in intermediate frequency alleles due to population structure as

731   opposed to panmixia (Supplementary Figures 26-27) was falsely inferred as a bottleneck (mean

732   fold change = 0.45-0.50; similar to Chikhi *et al.* 2010) by DFE-alpha, leading to incorrect

733   estimates of the DFE. As expected, these distortions of intermediate frequency alleles in the SFS

734   caused by population structure were observed to increase at higher selfing levels and at lower

735   migration rates, with particularly large deviations from panmixia observed at $N_{deme}m = 0.1$.

736   Empirical studies that draw from worldwide population samples may knowingly or

737   unknowingly sample unevenly from structured populations when performing DFE inference. To

738   investigate if this has unintended consequences on DFE inference, we repeated our experiments

739   with population structure, altering our sampling strategy to primarily draw genomes from one

740   deme (60%) or two demes (35% from each), with the remaining demes contributing only 10% of

741   the sampled genomes each. As expected, the site frequency spectra from both unevenly sampled

742   populations were observed to be even more distorted at intermediate frequencies than the evenly

743   sampled populations with low migration rates (Supplementary Figures 28-31). For the sampling

744   strategy primarily drawing from one deme, some DFE mis-inference towards nearly neutral and

745   strongly deleterious mutations was observed at 0% and 50% selfing even for $N_{deme}m = 1$ and

746   more strongly at $N_{deme}m = 0.5$, and this effect was stronger at the DFE with predominantly

747   weakly deleterious mutations (Supplementary Figure 32). This effect was also observed for the

748   sampling strategy primarily drawing from two demes, but to a lesser extent (Supplementary

749   Figure 33). At the lowest migration rate, the inferred DFEs for both uneven sampling cases were

750   substantially less deleterious at 0% and 50% selfing than for even sampling, particularly for the

25

751 DFE with predominantly weakly deleterious mutations (Figure 7). At higher selfing levels, the

752 inferred DFEs for all sampling schemes falsely inferred a larger proportion of weakly deleterious

753 mutations than predicted by the DFE corrected for BGS (Figure 7), likely due to a combination

754 of HRI and uneven sampling. The BGS-corrected DFE was unable to correct for the mis-

755 inference of the DFE for all selfing levels at the lowest migration rate, reflecting the fact that

756 DFE mis-inference is likely driven by changes in the SFS caused by population structure rather

757 than changes in the level of BGS.

758   Overall, these results indicate both DFE inference approaches are fairly robust to

759 population structure in an island model, even with uneven sampling, until the populations

760 become extremely isolated from each other, or individuals are mostly drawn from one deme,

761 especially when the true DFE has a significant proportion of mildly deleterious mutations.

762 Additionally, both low rates of migration and highly uneven sampling result in the inference of a

763 DFE even more skewed towards weakly deleterious mutations than simulated. Testing DFE

764 inference with more models of population structure and additional sampling strategies might be

765 necessary to interpret empirically estimated DFEs from natural populations.

766

767

768 **DISCUSSION**

769 Inference of the distribution of fitness effects (DFE) of new mutations is a critical step in

770 understanding the forces that shape genetic variation in a population. Population genetic methods

771 to infer the DFE that account for nonequilibrium demography usually assume independent

772 segregation of putatively neutral and selected sites (Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2007; Keightley

773 and Eyre-Walker 2007; Galtier 2016; Tataru et al. 2017). However, organisms that have little/ no

774 recombination, for instance, those that undergo high rates of selfing or asexual reproduction, are

775 likely to violate this assumption. A major consequence of strong linkage is the increase in HRI

776 effects that lower the efficacy of selection. When the regime of classical BGS and sweeps is

777 predominant, inferred population-scaled selection coefficients are biased, but accounting for the

778 relative decrease in the rate of coalescence can provide reasonably accurate estimates of the

779 selection coefficients. However, when interference between selected alleles is pervasive, the

780 estimation of the distribution of selection coefficients is also severely mis-inferred. We also find

781 that while purging of partially recessive deleterious mutations does not lead to mis-inference, the

782   presence of cryptic population structure where there is a low rate of migration between

783   subpopulations and/or sampling from predominantly one subpopulation leads to inferring a DFE

784   (in terms of the population-scaled coefficients) skewed towards effectively neutral/mildly

785   deleterious class of mutations. Moreover, the proportion of beneficial substitutions (α) is

786   substantially overestimated in highly selfing species, suggesting caution when performing

787   inference in species or genomic regions with little/no recombination.

788

789   **Why is the DFE estimated from *C. elegans* populations not skewed towards mildly**

790   **deleterious mutations?**

791   While our study suggests that DFE inference in highly selfing species should yield population-

792   scaled selection coefficients skewed towards weakly/moderately deleterious mutations,

793   surprisingly, the previous empirical estimate of the *C. elegans* DFE using DFE-alpha is heavily

794   skewed towards the class of strongly deleterious mutations ($2N_e\overline{s_d} > 10,000$, Gilbert *et al.*

795   2022). One explanation of this discrepancy is that the mean $2N_e\overline{s_d}$ of the population is even

796   greater than 10,000. Interestingly, direct measurements of fitness-related traits in mutation

797   accumulation lines suggest that *C. elegans* has a highly deleterious DFE, with estimates of the

798   mean deleterious selection coefficient ranging from -0.09 to -0.46 (Vassilieva et al. 2000; Baer et

799   al. 2005; Katju et al. 2015). Thus, using previously calculated *C. elegans* N_e ranging from 5,000

800   to 80,000 (Table 4 in Teterina *et al.* 2023), the expected $2NB\overline{s_d}$ would range from 900 to 72,000,

801   consistent with this explanation. However, there are a few major caveats to these observations.

802   (a) The experimental estimates of selection coefficients are likely biased towards more

803   deleterious selection coefficients due to the difficulty of measuring small fitness changes in

804   experimental lines (Davies et al. 1999; Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2007), and might not reflect

805   fitness effects in the wild. (b) It is unclear whether previous estimates of the population sizes of

806   *C. elegans* populations using neutral nucleotide diversity (Barrière and Félix 2005; Cutter 2006;

807   Rockman and Kruglyak 2009; Teterina et al. 2023) are accurate due to the joint effects of selfing,

808   HRI, and demography (c) Empirical estimates of the deleterious DFE in *C. elegans* (Gilbert *et al.*

809   2022) were obtained by sampling worldwide rather than from local populations, and thus other

810   factors such as complex demographic history and population structure could play a role as well.

811   For instance, selfing populations are likely to follow extinction-recolonization dynamics

812   (Charlesworth and Wright 2001; Ingvarsson 2002; Wright et al. 2013) and such models remain

813   understudied.

814   A second explanation for the discrepancy between the expected and observed DFE in *C.*

815   *elegans* is that the true selfing rate in wild *C. elegans* might be lower than 99%, thus reducing

816   linked effects of selection. Though selfing rate estimates from unique populations range from

817   80% to ~100% using various methods (Barrière and Félix 2005; Sivasundar and Hey 2005;

818   Teterina et al. 2023), in general, the high LD in *C. elegans* populations (haplotype blocks of 2.5

819   Mb on average; Cutter 2006) along with low frequency of males in wild specimens (Barrière and

820   Félix 2005; Richaud et al. 2018) suggest the outcrossing rate is very low in most populations. A

821   recent study using whole-genome sequencing data focusing on Hawaiian *C. elegans* estimated a

822   relatively lower selfing rate of 93%, suggesting that selfing rate can vary across populations

823   (Teterina et al. 2023). Importantly, as the samples used in Gilbert *et al.* (2022) were unevenly

824   sampled worldwide (with many samples from Hawaiian populations), variation in selfing rate

825   across populations or through time could additionally influence DFE inference results.

826   A third possibility relates to the difficulty in obtaining the SFS using highly inbred

827   strains. The SNP-calling pipeline used to obtain *C. elegans* population-genetic data converted

828   heterozygous sites into homozygous reference or alternate alleles depending on if the mutant was

829   above or below 50% (Cook et al. 2017). This method of SNP processing could lead to the

830   inference of a more deleterious DFE if the heterozygote frequency is higher at neutral sites than

831   selected sites by skewing the neutral SFS towards higher frequencies and the selected SFS

832   towards lower frequencies, though the low frequency of heterozygotes in highly selfing

833   populations makes this unlikely to be a large issue. Future studies working with inbred strains

834   should evaluate the effect of employing such SNP processing approaches on population genomic

835   inference.

836   Finally, we have only examined a population under equilibrium in the current study,

837   whereas a recent population expansion/ contraction could decrease the observed effects of

838   interference between selected alleles at multiple loci, allowing for a correct inference of selection

839   coefficients. HRI effects in non-equilibrium populations remain to be studied more thoroughly.

840   Unfortunately, as linked effects of selection will also lead to falsely inferring recent population

841   growth (Supplementary Table 1; Ewing and Jensen 2016; Schrider *et al.* 2016; Johri *et al.* 2021),

842   there is no straightforward solution to accounting for the effects of the true demography (Johri,

843   Eyre-Walker, et al. 2022). Thus performing a joint inference of demography and the DFE as

844   employed by Johri *et al.* (2020) is likely to be the most promising approach to circumvent this

845   challenge.

846

847   **How broadly do our results apply**?

848   Our results have implications for the population genetics of other highly selfing

849   organisms, many of which could fall into a parameter space where linked effects of selection are

850   pervasive. A key factor that determines the extent of HRI is the number (U_d) of new deleterious

851   mutations per diploid genome per generation, with higher values of NU_d relative to NR causing

852   more interference. Thus, the extent of HRI across species would likely differ due to differences

853   in outcrossing rates, population sizes, mutation and recombination rates, and genome architecture

854   (McVean and Charlesworth 2000; Comeron and Kreitman 2002; Kaiser and Charlesworth 2009;

855   Good et al. 2014). Our Figure 3 suggests that the extent of background selection (measured by *B*)

856   is a good predictor of the possible extent of HRI and that $B < 0.5$ could result in substantial

857   misinference. Interestingly, a number of highly selfing species may have reasonably low *B*

858   values (Table 2). In addition to *C. elegans*, a variety of species such as *C. briggsae*, *A. tauschii*,

859   *A. thaliana*, *C. bursa-pastoris*, *C. orientalis,* and *S. lycopersicon* have their lowest *B* value

860   estimates below 0.25, with *C. elegans, C. briggsae,* and *S. lycopersicon* also exhibiting values of

861      $U_d/R_{self} > 5$. Interestingly, *C. elegans* has been observed to have a U-shaped SFS in many

862   samples (Freund et al. 2023), consistent with HRI, though in empirical data a variety of

863   explanations such as ancestral allele misorientation, positive selection, and various demographic

864   effects could explain a U-shaped SFS (Freund et al. 2023). This could pose problems for

865   methods that infer the dominance coefficients of mutations by comparing the DFEs of closely

866   related selfing and obligate outcrossing species, such as a recent study of *Arabidopsis* (Huber et

867   al. 2018), and thus efforts to quantify the levels of HRI in highly selfing species merits additional

868   investigations. In addition to selfing organisms, pathogenic species like *Plasmodium* ($U_d = 0.25$;

869   Lynch *et al.* 2016) that have variable rates of sexual reproduction between genetically identical

870   clones (and thus experience reduced rates of recombination), seem to have nearly identical

871   neutral and selected site frequency spectra (Figure 3 in Parobek *et al.* 2016), suggesting that HRI

872   effects might play an important role in shaping variation across their genomes. We therefore also

873   expect DFE inference to be biased due to HRI in asexual organisms, mitochondrial genomes, and

874   the Y chromosome, all of which have low effective recombination rates (Barton and

875   Charlesworth 1998; Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000; Weinreich and Rand 2000).

876   Importantly, as structural variants (Adrion et al. 2017; Abel et al. 2020) and mutations in

877   noncoding regions (Racimo and Schraiber 2014) are a significant source of deleterious mutations

878   accounting for the input of other mutation types is likely to increase the estimated value of U_d,

879   making HRI more likely in populations with little/no recombination.

880

881

882   **Considerations for inferring the DFE in highly selfing organisms**

883   Given our observations, we here provide a few points to consider when inferring the DFE of new

884   mutations in organisms with little/no recombination, where effects of BGS, selective sweeps, or

885   HRI might be pervasive:

886   (1) The DFE of new deleterious mutations estimated using the two-step population-

887   genetic methods is most closely explained by the distribution of $2NBs_d$, which is equivalent to

888    $2N_{emp}(1 + F)s_d$ in partially selfing populations. Here N_{emp} represents the effective population

889   size estimated using neutral nucleotide diversity , which includes the effects of BGS and is what

890   is usually estimated using demographic inference approaches that do not account for linked

891   effects of selection. Thus, if there exist experimentally validated estimates of selfing rates, it is

892   possible to accurately infer the distribution of selection coefficients in populations with moderate

893   levels of selfing. However, in many organisms selfing rates are inferred using allele frequencies

894   and those estimates are likely to be biased by population history and effects of selection at linked

895   sites. Moreover, this raises the question of how one can accurately simulate an estimated DFE (in

896   terms of population-scaled selection coefficients) when multiple linked selected sites are to be

897   simulated, which will be especially important to determine the extent of HRI effects in

898   populations with little/no recombination.

899   (2) Different models of population structure and the effects of demographic changes need

900   to be considered to fully understand the robustness of DFE inference. For instance, it is known

901   that local populations of selfing organisms are prone to recurrent extinction and recolonization

902   events (Pannell and Charlesworth 1999; Ingvarsson 2002) which may bias DFE inference

903   further. Indeed, recent field studies of *C. elegans* populations suggest that 3-10 individuals

904   colonize a food source and quickly reproduce to census sizes of up to 10,000 individuals before

905   dispersing in search of new food sources (Barrière and Félix 2005; Richaud et al. 2018). When

906   sampling across many demes, we suggest also inferring the DFE in isolated populations to

907   minimize biases due to cryptic population structure or uneven sampling and to downsample the

908   number of genomes such that sampling is as even as possible across demes. Sampling strategies

909   such as a scattered sampling scheme may be useful in removing such bias (Wakeley 1999;

910   Städler et al. 2009), though the reduction in sample size may reduce the ability to accurately infer

911   the moderate and deleterious portions of the DFE (Kim et al. 2017).

912   (3) If possible, it could be helpful to infer the DFE in closely related non-selfing species

913   or in different populations of the same species with known differences in selfing rates. For

914   instance, *C. elegans* and *A. thaliana* populations vary in the estimated rates of selfing by ~10%,

915   and the mostly outcrossing *A. lyrata* has several populations that have evolved partial selfing

916   (Mable et al. 2005; Bomblies et al. 2010; Teterina et al. 2023). Though differences such as

917   population structure and demography need to be carefully accounted for, statistical comparisons

918   across populations/species with flexible DFE inference frameworks (Sendrowski and Bataillon

919   2024) could also be used to approximate the extent of HRI in a selfing species.

920   (4) Finally, in the cases where HRI is determined to be extensive, joint inference of

921   demography and the DFE as employed by Johri *et al.* in *D. melanogaster* (2020) and human

922   (2022) populations could be especially useful for DFE inference. They employed an approximate

923   Bayesian computation (Beaumont et al. 2002) framework combined with forward simulations to

924   jointly infer parameters of the DFE of new deleterious mutations and an arbitrary size change,

925   while accounting for the effects of selection at linked sites. While highly successful, such an

926   approach has been limited to a relatively simple demographic model of a single size change in

927   one population due to the large number of parameters required to be jointly estimated. In

928   addition, our work here indicates that simulation rescaling may have to be limited to accurately

929   capture the dynamics of Hill-Robertson interference, which will further increase the

930   computational burden of simulations. However, if computationally feasible, such an approach

931   could yield the most likely distribution of selection coefficients, especially because, the

932   distortions of the SFS from a neutral model caused by interference cannot be explained by any

933   constant N_e (see discussion in Neher 2013; Good *et al.* 2014; Melissa *et al.* 2022). Thus, until

934   theoretical models can accurately estimate the effects of HRI in organisms with little/no

935   recombination with complex DFEs, simulation-based approaches will be the most helpful in

936   inferring the DFE of new mutations in such populations, as well as obtaining the fixation

937   probability of new mutations, which will be altered by HRI.

938

939

952

953

954   **DATA AVAILABILITY**

955   The following data are publicly available on https://github.com/JohriLab/DFESelfing: (1) Data

956   and scripts to reproduce figures; (2) Config files used for DFE inference; (3) Simulation outputs

957   in SLiM format; (4) templates and example scripts for launching SLiM simulations.

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

REFERENCES

Abel HJ, Larson DE, Regier AA, Chiang C, Das I, Kanchi KL, Layer RM, Neale BM, Salerno WJ, Reeves C, et al. 2020. Mapping and characterization of structural variation in 17,795 human genomes. Nature. 583(7814):83–89. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2371-0.

Adrion JR, Song MJ, Schrider DR, Hahn MW, Schaack S. 2017. Genome-wide estimates of transposable element insertion and deletion rates in Drosophila melanogaster. Genome biology and evolution. 9(5):1329–1340. doi:10.1093/gbe/evx050.

Agrawal AF, Whitlock MC. 2011. Inferences about the distribution of dominance drawn from Yeast gene knockout data. Genetics. 187(2):553–566. doi:10.1534/genetics.110.124560.

Ågren JA, Wang W, Koenig D, Neuffer B, Weigel D, Wright SI. 2014. Mating system shifts and transposable element evolution in the plant genus *Capsella*. BMC Genom. 15(1):602. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-15-602.

Anderson JL, Morran LT, Phillips PC. 2010. Outcrossing and the maintenance of males within *C. elegans* populations. J Hered. 101(Suppl 1):S62–S74. doi:10.1093/jhered/esq003.

Arunkumar R, Ness RW, Wright SI, Barrett SCH. 2015. The evolution of selfing is accompanied by reduced efficacy of selection and purging of deleterious mutations. Genetics. 199(3):817–829. doi:10.1534/genetics.114.172809.

Baer CF, Shaw F, Steding C, Baumgartner M, Hawkins A, Houppert A, Mason N, Reed M, Simonelic K, Woodard W, et al. 2005. Comparative evolutionary genetics of spontaneous mutations affecting fitness in rhabditid nematodes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 102(16):5785–5790. doi:10.1073/pnas.0406056102.

Bah S, van der Merwe R, Labuschagne MT. 2017. Estimation of outcrossing rates in intraspecific (*Oryza sativa*) and interspecific (*Oryza sativa* × *Oryza glaberrima*) rice under field conditions using agro-morphological markers. Euphytica. 213(4):81. doi:10.1007/s10681-017-1872-x.

Bank C, Ewing GB, Ferrer-Admettla A, Foll M, Jensen JD. 2014. Thinking too positive? Revisiting current methods of population genetic selection inference. Trends Genet. 30(12):540–546. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2014.09.010.

Barrière A, Félix M-A. 2005. High local genetic diversity and low outcrossing rate in *Caenorhabditis elegans* natural populations. Curr Biol. 15(13):1176–1184. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.06.022.

Barrière A, Félix M-A. 2007. Temporal dynamics and linkage disequilibrium in natural *Caenorhabditis elegans* populations. Genetics. 176(2):999–1011. doi:10.1534/genetics.106.067223.

Barton NH, Charlesworth B. 1998. Why sex and recombination? Science. 281(5385):1986–1990. doi:10.1126/science.281.5385.1986.

Beaumont MA, Zhang W, Balding DJ. 2002. Approximate Bayesian computation in population genetics. Genetics. 162(4):2025–2035. doi:10.1093/genetics/162.4.2025.

Becher H, Jackson BC, Charlesworth B. 2020. Patterns of genetic variability in genomic regions with low rates of recombination. Curr Biol. 30(1):94-100.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2019.10.047.

Bomblies K, Yant L, Laitinen RA, Kim S-T, Hollister JD, Warthmann N, Fitz J, Weigel D. 2010. Local-scale patterns of genetic variability, outcrossing, and spatial structure in natural stands of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. PLoS Genet. 6(3):e1000890. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000890.

Burgarella C, Brémaud M-F, Von Hirschheydt G, Viader V, Ardisson M, Santoni S, Ranwez V, de Navascués M, David J, Glémin S. 2024. Mating systems and recombination landscape strongly shape genetic diversity and selection in wheat relatives. Evolution Letters.:qrae039. doi:10.1093/evlett/qrae039.

C. elegans Sequencing Consortium. 1998. Genome sequence of the nematode *C. elegans*: a platform for investigating biology. Science. 282(5396):2012–8. doi:10.1126/science.282.5396.2012.

Caballero A, Hill WG. 1992. Effects of partial inbreeding on fixation rates and variation of mutant genes. Genetics. 131(2):493–507.

Caballero A, Keightley PD, Hill WG. 1991. Strategies for increasing fixation probabilities of recessive mutations. Genet Res. 58(2):129–138. doi:10.1017/S0016672300029785.

Campos JL, Charlesworth B. 2019. The effects on neutral variability of recurrent selective sweeps and background selection. Genetics. 212(1):287–303. doi:10.1534/genetics.119.301951.

Charlesworth B. 1992. Evolutionary rates in partially self-fertilizing species. Am Nat. 140(1):126–148. doi:10.1086/285406.

Charlesworth B. 1994. The effect of background selection against deleterious mutations on weakly selected, linked variants. Genet Res. 63(3):213–227. doi:10.1017/S0016672300032365.

Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. 1998. Some evolutionary consequences of deleterious mutations. Genetica. 102(0):3–19. doi:10.1023/A:1017066304739.

Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. 2000. The degeneration of Y chromosomes. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 355(1403):1563–1572.

Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. 2010. Elements of Evolutionary Genetics. Greenwoord Village, Colorado, USA: Roberts and Company. [accessed 2023 Dec 10]. https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/elements-of-evolutionary-genetics.

Charlesworth B, Jensen JD. 2021. Effects of selection at linked sites on patterns of genetic variability. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 52:177–197. doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-010621-044528.

Charlesworth B, Morgan MT, Charlesworth D. 1993. The effect of deleterious mutations on neutral molecular variation. Genetics. 134(4):1289–1303. doi:10.1093/genetics/134.4.1289.

Charlesworth D. 2003. Effects of inbreeding on the genetic diversity of populations. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 358(1434):1051–1070. doi:10.1098/rstb.2003.1296.

Charlesworth D, Charlesworth B. 1987. Inbreeding depression and its evolutionary consequences. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 18(1):237–268. doi:10.1146/annurev.es.18.110187.001321.

Charlesworth D, Wright SI. 2001. Breeding systems and genome evolution. Curr Opin Genet Dev. 11(6):685–690. doi:10.1016/s0959-437x(00)00254-9.

Cheng C-Y, Krishnakumar V, Chan AP, Thibaud-Nissen F, Schobel S, Town CD. 2017. Araport11: a complete reannotation of the *Arabidopsis thaliana* reference genome. Plant J. 89(4):789–804. doi:10.1111/tpj.13415.

Chikhi L, Sousa VC, Luisi P, Goossens B, Beaumont MA. 2010. The confounding effects of population structure, genetic diversity and the sampling scheme on the detection and quantification of population size changes. Genetics. 186(3):983–995. doi:10.1534/genetics.110.118661.

Comeron JM, Kreitman M. 2002. Population, evolutionary and genomic consequences of interference selection. Genetics. 161(1):389–410. doi:10.1093/genetics/161.1.389.

Comeron JM, Kreitman M, Aguadé M. 1999. Natural selection on synonymous sites is correlated with gene length and recombination in *Drosophila*. Genetics. 151(1):239–249. doi:10.1093/genetics/151.1.239.

Cook DE, Zdraljevic S, Roberts JP, Andersen EC. 2017. CeNDR, the *Caenorhabditis elegans* natural diversity resource. Nucleic Acids Res. 45(D1):D650–D657. doi:10.1093/nar/gkw893.

Crow JF, Kimura, M. 1970. An Introduction to Population Genetics Theory. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cutter AD. 2006. Nucleotide polymorphism and linkage disequilibrium in wild populations of the partial selfer *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Genetics. 172(1):171–184. doi:10.1534/genetics.105.048207.

Cvijović I, Good BH, Desai MM. 2018. The effect of strong purifying selection on genetic diversity. Genetics. 209(4):1235–1278. doi:10.1534/genetics.118.301058.

Davies EK, Peters AD, Keightley PD. 1999. High frequency of cryptic deleterious mutations in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Science. 285(5434):1748–1751. doi:10.1126/science.285.5434.1748.

De Leon TB, Linscombe S, Subudhi PK. 2016. Molecular dissection of seedling salinity tolerance in rice (*Oryza sativa L.*) using a high-density GBS-based SNP linkage map. Rice. 9(1):52. doi:10.1186/s12284-016-0125-2.

Denver DR, Morris K, Lynch M, Thomas WK. 2004. High mutation rate and predominance of insertions in the *Caenorhabditis elegans* nuclear genome. Nature. 430(7000):679–682. doi:10.1038/nature02697.

Estes S, Phillips PC, Denver DR, Thomas WK, Lynch M. 2004. Mutation accumulation in populations of varying size: The distribution of mutational effects for fitness correlates in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Genetics. 166(3):1269–1279. doi:10.1534/genetics.166.3.1269.

Ewens WJ. 1979. Mathematical Population Genetics. Berlin: Springer (Antman SS, Marsden JE, Sirovich L, Wiggins S, editors. Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics). [accessed 2024 Apr 14]. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-0-387-21822-9.

Ewing GB, Jensen JD. 2016. The consequences of not accounting for background selection in demographic inference. Mol Ecol. 25(1):135–141. doi:10.1111/mec.13390.

Eyre-Walker A, Keightley PD. 2007. The distribution of fitness effects of new mutations. Nat Rev Genet. 8(8):610–618. doi:10.1038/nrg2146.

Eyre-Walker A, Keightley PD. 2009. Estimating the rate of adaptive molecular evolution in the presence of slightly deleterious mutations and population size change. Mol Biol Evol. 26(9):2097–2108. doi:10.1093/molbev/msp119.

Eyre-Walker A, Woolfit M, Phelps T. 2006. The distribution of fitness effects of new deleterious amino acid mutations in humans. Genetics. 173(2):891–900. doi:10.1534/genetics.106.057570.

Fay JC, Wu C-I. Hitchhiking Under Positive Darwinian Selection. :9. doi:10.1093/genetics/155.3.1405.

Felsenstein J. 1974. The evolutionary advantage of recombination. Genetics. 78(2):737–756. doi:10.1093/genetics/78.2.737.

1106 Ferrer-Admetlla A, Liang M, Korneliussen T, Nielsen R. 2014. On detecting incomplete soft or
1107   hard selective sweeps using haplotype structure. MBE. 31(5):1275–1291.
1108   doi:10.1093/molbev/msu077.
1109 Freund F, Kerdoncuff E, Matuszewski S, Lapierre M, Hildebrandt M, Jensen JD, Ferretti L,
1110   Lambert A, Sackton TB, Achaz G. 2023. Interpreting the pervasive observation of U-
1111   shaped Site Frequency Spectra. PLoS Genet. 19(3):e1010677.
1112   doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1010677.
1113 Galtier N. 2016. Adaptive protein evolution in animals and the effective population size
1114   hypothesis. PLoS Genet. 12(1):e1005774. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005774.
1115 Garcia JA, Lohmueller KE. 2021. Negative linkage disequilibrium between amino acid changing
1116   variants reveals interference among deleterious mutations in the human genome. PLoS
1117   Genet. 17(7):e1009676. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009676.
1118 Gilbert KJ, Zdraljevic S, Cook DE, Cutter AD, Andersen EC, Baer CF. 2022. The distribution of
1119   mutational effects on fitness in *Caenorhabditis elegans* inferred from standing genetic
1120   variation. Moyle L, editor. Genetics. 220(1):iyab166. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyab166.
1121 Glémin S. 2003. How are deleterious mutations purged? Drift versus nonrandom mating.
1122   Evolution. 57(12):2678–2687. doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb01512.x.
1123 Good BH, Walczak AM, Neher RA, Desai MM. 2014. Genetic diversity in the interference
1124   selection limit. PLoS Genet. 10(3):e1004222. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004222.
1125 Goodwillie C, Kalisz S, Eckert CG. 2005. The evolutionary enigma of mixed mating systems in
1126   plants: Occurrence, theoretical explanations, and empirical evidence. Annu Rev Ecol
1127   Syst. 36(1):47–79. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.091704.175539.
1128 Gorton AJ, Heath KD, Pilet-Nayel M-L, Baranger A, Stinchcombe JR. 2012. Mapping the
1129   genetic basis of symbiotic variation in legume-rhizobium interactions in *Medicago*
1130   *truncatula*. G3. 2(11):1291–1303. doi:10.1534/g3.112.003269.
1131 Haller BC, Messer PW. 2023. SLiM 4: Multispecies eco-evolutionary modeling. Am Nat.
1132   201(5):E127–E139. doi:10.1086/723601.
1133 Hartfield M, Bataillon T. 2020. Selective sweeps under dominance and inbreeding. G3.
1134   10(3):1063–1075. doi:10.1534/g3.119.400919.
1135 Hartfield M, Glémin S. 2014. Hitchhiking of deleterious alleles and the cost of adaptation in
1136   partially selfing species. Genetics. 196(1):281–293. doi:10.1534/genetics.113.158196.
1137 Hartfield M, Glémin S. 2016. Limits to adaptation in partially selfing species. Genetics.
1138   203(2):959–974. doi:10.1534/genetics.116.188821.
1139 Hedrick PW. 1980. Hitchhiking: a comparison of linkage and partial selfing. Genetics.
1140   94(3):791–808. doi:10.1093/genetics/94.3.791.
1141 Hill WG, Robertson A. 1966. The effect of linkage on limits to artificial selection. Genet Res.
1142   8(3):269–294. doi:10.1017/S0016672300010156.
1143 Hill WG, Robertson A. 1968. Linkage disequilibrium in finite populations. Theoret Appl
1144   Genetics. 38(6):226–231. doi:10.1007/BF01245622.
1145 Hodgkin J. 1983. Male phenotypes and mating efficiency in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Genetics.
1146   103(1):43–64. doi:10.1093/genetics/103.1.43.
1147 Horneburg B, Becker HC. 2018. Spontaneous outcrossing in tomato depends on cultivar and
1148   environment and varies between individual flowers. Plant Breed. 137(4):638–643.
1149   doi:10.1111/pbr.12600.

Huang X, Fortier AL, Coffman AJ, Struck TJ, Irby MN, James JE, León-Burguete JE, Ragsdale AP, Gutenkunst RN. 2021. Inferring genome-wide correlations of mutation fitness effects between populations. Mol Biol Evol. 38(10):4588–4602. doi:10.1093/molbev/msab162.

Huber CD, Kim BY, Marsden CD, Lohmueller KE. 2017. Determining the factors driving selective effects of new nonsynonymous mutations. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 114(17):4465–4470. doi:10.1073/pnas.1619508114.

Ingvarsson PK. 2002. A metapopulation perspective on genetic diversity and differentiation in partially self-fertilizing plants. Evolution. 56(12):2368–2373. doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb00162.x.

Jarne P, Auld JR. 2006. Animals mix it up too: the distribution of self-fertilization among hermaphroditic animals. Evolution. 60(9):1816–1824. doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2006.tb00525.x.

Johri P, Aquadro CF, Beaumont M, Charlesworth B, Excoffier L, Eyre-Walker A, Keightley PD, Lynch M, McVean G, Payseur BA, et al. 2022. Recommendations for improving statistical inference in population genomics. PLoS Biol. 20(5):e3001669. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001669.

Johri P, Charlesworth B. 2024. A gene-based model of fitness and its implications for genetic variation. :2024.09.12.612686. doi:10.1101/2024.09.12.612686. [accessed 2024 Sep 18]. https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.09.12.612686v1.

Johri P, Charlesworth B, Jensen JD. 2020. Toward an evolutionarily appropriate null model: jointly inferring demography and purifying selection. Genetics. 215(1):173–192. doi:10.1534/genetics.119.303002.

Johri P, Eyre-Walker A, Gutenkunst RN, Lohmueller KE, Jensen JD. 2022. On the prospect of achieving accurate joint estimation of selection with population history. Genome Biol Evol. 14(7):evac088. doi:10.1093/gbe/evac088.

Johri P, Riall K, Becher H, Excoffier L, Charlesworth B, Jensen JD. 2021. The impact of purifying and background selection on the inference of population history: problems and prospects. Mol Biol Evol. 38(7):2986–3003. doi:10.1093/molbev/msab050.

Jullien M, Ronfort J, Gay L. 2021. How and when does outcrossing occur in the predominantly selfing species *Medicago truncatula*? Front Plant Sci. 12:619154. doi:10.3389/fpls.2021.619154.

Kaiser VB, Charlesworth B. 2009. The effects of deleterious mutations on evolution in non-recombining genomes. Trends Genet. 25(1):9–12. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2008.10.009.

Kamran-Disfani A, Agrawal AF. 2014. Selfing, adaptation and background selection in finite populations. J Evol Biol. 27(7):1360–1371. doi:10.1111/jeb.12343.

Katju V, Packard LB, Bu L, Keightley PD, Bergthorsson U. 2015. Fitness decline in spontaneous mutation accumulation lines of *Caenorhabditis elegans* with varying effective population sizes. Evolution. 69(1):104–16. doi:10.1111/evo.12554.

Keightley PD, Eyre-Walker A. 2007. Joint inference of the distribution of fitness effects of deleterious mutations and population demography based on nucleotide polymorphism frequencies. Genetics. 177(4):2251–2261. doi:10.1534/genetics.107.080663.

Kim BY, Huber CD, Lohmueller KE. 2017. Inference of the distribution of selection coefficients for new nonsynonymous mutations using large samples. Genetics. 206(1):345–361. doi:10.1534/genetics.116.197145.

Konrad A, Brady MJ, Bergthorsson U, Katju V. 2019. Mutational landscape of spontaneous base substitutions and small indels in experimental *Caenorhabditis elegans* populations of differing size. Genetics. 212(3):837–854. doi:10.1534/genetics.119.302054.

Kousathanas A, Keightley PD. 2013. A comparison of models to infer the distribution of fitness effects of new mutations. Genetics. 193(4):1197–1208. doi:10.1534/genetics.112.148023.

Lewontin RC. 1964. The interaction of selection and linkage. I. general considerations; heterotic models. Genetics. 49(1):49–67. doi:10.1093/genetics/49.1.49.

Lewontin RC. 1988. On measures of gametic disequilibrium. Genetics. 120(3):849–852. doi:10.1093/genetics/120.3.849.

Li W-H. 1987. Models of nearly neutral mutations with particular implications for nonrandom usage of synonymous codons. J Mol Evol. 24(4):337–345. doi:10.1007/BF02134132.

Linde M, Diel S, Neuffer B. 2001. Flowering ecotypes of *Capsella bursa-pastoris*(L.) Medik. (Brassicaceae) analysed by a cosegregation of phenotypic characters (QTL) and molecular markers. Ann Bot. 87(1):91–99. doi:10.1006/anbo.2000.1308.

Ling H-Q, Ma B, Shi X, Liu H, Dong L, Sun H, Cao Y, Gao Q, Zheng S, Li Ye, et al. 2018. Genome sequence of the progenitor of wheat A subgenome *Triticum urartu*. Nature. 557(7705):424–428. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0108-0.

Luo M-C, Gu YQ, You FM, Deal KR, Ma Y, Hu Y, Huo N, Wang Y, Wang J, Chen S, et al. 2013. A 4-gigabase physical map unlocks the structure and evolution of the complex genome of *Aegilops tauschii*, the wheat D-genome progenitor. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 110(19):7940–7945. doi:10.1073/pnas.1219082110.

Mable BK, Robertson AV, Dart S, Di Berardo C, Witham L. 2005. Breakdown of self-incompatibility in the perennial *Arabidopsis lyrata* (*Brassicaceae*) and its genetic consequences. Evolution. 59(7):1437–1448.

Manna F, Martin G, Lenormand T. 2011. Fitness landscapes: An alternative theory for the dominance of mutation. Genetics. 189(3):923–937. doi:10.1534/genetics.111.132944.

Maruyama T. 1970. Effective number of alleles in a subdivided population. Theor Popul Biol. 1(3):273–306. doi:10.1016/0040-5809(70)90047-X.

Maureira-Butler IJ, Pfeil BE, Muangprom A, Osborn TC, Doyle JJ. 2008. The reticulate history of *Medicago* (*Fabaceae*). Syst Biol. 57(3):466–482. doi:10.1080/10635150802172168.

McVean GA, Charlesworth B. 2000. The effects of Hill-Robertson interference between weakly selected mutations on patterns of molecular evolution and variation. Genetics. 155(2):929–944.

Melissa MJ, Good BH, Fisher DS, Desai MM. 2022. Population genetics of polymorphism and divergence in rapidly evolving populations. Genetics. 221(4):iyac053. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyac053.

Neher RA. 2013. Genetic draft, selective interference, and population genetics of rapid adaptation. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 44(1):195–215. doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110512-135920.

Neher RA, Hallatschek O. 2013. Genealogies of rapidly adapting populations. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 110(2):437–442. doi:10.1073/pnas.1213113110.

Nei M. 1968. The frequency distribution of lethal chromosomes in finite populations. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 60(2):517–524. doi:10.1073/pnas.60.2.517.

Nei M. 1973. Analysis of gene diversity in subdivided populations. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 70(12):3321–3323. doi:10.1073/pnas.70.12.3321.

1239 Nei M, Tajima F. 1981. DNA polymorphism detectable by restriction endonucleases. Genetics.
1240   97(1):145–163. doi:10.1093/genetics/97.1.145.
1241 Nicolaisen LE, Desai MM. 2013. Distortions in genealogies due to purifying selection and
1242   recombination. Genetics. 195(1):221–230. doi:10.1534/genetics.113.152983.
1243 Nordborg M. 2000. Linkage disequilibrium, gene trees and selfing: an ancestral recombination
1244   graph with partial self-fertilization. Genetics. 154(2):923–929.
1245   doi:10.1093/genetics/154.2.923.
1246 O'Fallon BD, Seger J, Adler FR. 2010. A continuous-state coalescent and the impact of weak
1247   selection on the structure of gene genealogies. Mol Biol Evol. 27(5):1162–1172.
1248   doi:10.1093/molbev/msq006.
1249 Ossowski S, Schneeberger K, Lucas-Lledó JI, Warthmann N, Clark RM, Shaw RG, Weigel D,
1250   Lynch M. 2010. The rate and molecular spectrum of spontaneous mutations in
1251   Arabidopsis thaliana. Science. 327(5961):92–94. doi:10.1126/science.1180677.
1252 Pannell JR, Charlesworth B. 1999. Neutral genetic diversity in a metapopulation with recurrent
1253   local extinction and recolonization. Evolution. 53(3):664–676. doi:10.1111/j.1558-
1254   5646.1999.tb05362.x.
1255 Parobek CM, Lin JT, Saunders DL, Barnett EJ, Lon C, Lanteri CA, Balasubramanian S, Brazeau
1256   N, DeConti DK, Garba DL, et al. 2016. Selective sweep suggests transcriptional
1257   regulation may underlie *Plasmodium vivax* resilience to malaria control measures in
1258   Cambodia. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 113(50):E8096–E8105.
1259   doi:10.1073/pnas.1608828113.
1260 Penin AA, Kasianov AS, Klepikova AV, Omelchenko DO, Makarenko MS, Logacheva MD.
1261   2024. Origin and diversity of *Capsella bursa-pastoris* from the genomic point of view.
1262   BMC Biology. 22(1):52. doi:10.1186/s12915-024-01832-1.
1263 Pollak E. 1987. On the theory of partially inbreeding finite populations. I. Partial selfing.
1264   Genetics. 117(2):353–360. doi:10.1093/genetics/117.2.353.
1265 Pruitt KD, Brown GR, Hiatt SM, Thibaud-Nissen F, Astashyn A, Ermolaeva O, Farrell CM, Hart
1266   J, Landrum MJ, McGarvey KM, et al. 2014. RefSeq: an update on mammalian reference
1267   sequences. Nucleic Acids Res. 42(Database issue):D756-763. doi:10.1093/nar/gkt1114.
1268 Racimo F, Schraiber JG. 2014. Approximation to the distribution of fitness effects across
1269   functional categories in human segregating polymorphisms. PLoS Genet.
1270   10(11):e1004697. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004697.
1271 Richaud A, Zhang G, Lee D, Lee J, Félix M-A. 2018. The Local Coexistence Pattern of Selfing
1272   Genotypes in Caenorhabditis elegans Natural Metapopulations. Genetics. 208(2):807–
1273   821. doi:10.1534/genetics.117.300564.
1274 Rockman MV, Kruglyak L. 2009. Recombinational landscape and population genomics of
1275   *Caenorhabditis elegans*. PLoS Genet. 5(3):e1000419. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000419.
1276 Roselius K, Stephan W, Städler T. 2005. The relationship of nucleotide polymorphism,
1277   recombination rate and selection in wild tomato species. Genetics. 171(2):753–763.
1278   doi:10.1534/genetics.105.043877.
1279 Roze D, Lenormand T. 2005. Self-fertilization and the evolution of recombination. Genetics.
1280   170(2):841–857. doi:10.1534/genetics.104.036384.
1281 Sanjuán R, Moya A, Elena SF. 2004. The distribution of fitness effects caused by single-
1282   nucleotide substitutions in an RNA virus. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 101(22):8396–8401.
1283   doi:10.1073/pnas.0400146101.

1284 Saxena AS, Salomon MP, Matsuba C, Yeh S-D, Baer CF. 2019. Evolution of the mutational
1285   process under relaxed selection in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Mol Biol Evol. 36(2):239–
1286   251. doi:10.1093/molbev/msy213.
1287 Schrider DR, Shanku AG, Kern AD. 2016. Effects of linked selective sweeps on demographic
1288   inference and model selection. Genetics. 204(3):1207–1223.
1289   doi:10.1534/genetics.116.190223.
1290 Seger J, Smith WA, Perry JJ, Hunn J, Kaliszewska ZA, Sala LL, Pozzi L, Rowntree VJ, Adler
1291   FR. 2010. Gene genealogies strongly distorted by weakly interfering mutations in
1292   constant environments. Genetics. 184(2):529–545. doi:10.1534/genetics.109.103556.
1293 Sendrowski J, Bataillon T. 2024. fastDFE: Fast and flexible inference of the distribution
1294   of fitness effects. Mol Biol Evol. 41(5):msae070. doi:10.1093/molbev/msae070.
1295 Sicard A, Lenhard M. 2011. The selfing syndrome: a model for studying the genetic and
1296   evolutionary basis of morphological adaptation in plants. Ann Bot. 107(9):1433–1443.
1297   doi:10.1093/aob/mcr023.
1298 Simmons MJ, Crow JF. 1977. Mutations affecting fitness in *Drosophila* populations. Ann Rev
1299   Genet. 11(1):49–78. doi:10.1146/annurev.ge.11.120177.000405.
1300 Singer T, Fan Y, Chang H-S, Zhu T, Hazen SP, Briggs SP. 2006. A high-resolution map of
1301   *Arabidopsis* recombinant inbred lines by whole-genome exon array hybridization. PLoS
1302   Genet. 2(9):e144. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.0020144.
1303 Sivasundar A, Hey J. 2005. Sampling from natural populations with RNAI reveals high
1304   outcrossing and population structure in Caenorhabditis elegans. Curr Biol. 15(17):1598–
1305   1602. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.08.034.
1306 Slatkin M, Voelm L. 1991. F_{ST} in a hierarchical island model. Genetics. 127(3):627–629.
1307   doi:10.1093/genetics/127.3.627.
1308 Snape JW, Lawrence MJ. 1971. The breeding system of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Heredity.
1309   27(2):299–302. doi:10.1038/hdy.1971.91.
1310 Städler T, Haubold B, Merino C, Stephan W, Pfaffelhuber P. 2009. The impact of sampling
1311   schemes on the site frequency spectrum in nonequilibrium subdivided populations.
1312   Genetics. 182(1):205–216. doi:10.1534/genetics.108.094904.
1313 Su X, Wang B, Geng X, Du Y, Yang Q, Liang B, Meng G, Gao Q, Yang W, Zhu Y, et al. 2021.
1314   A high-continuity and annotated tomato reference genome. BMC Genom. 22(1):898.
1315   doi:10.1186/s12864-021-08212-x.
1316 Tataru P, Mollion M, Glémin S, Bataillon T. 2017. Inference of distribution of fitness effects and
1317   proportion of adaptive substitutions from polymorphism data. Genetics. 207(3):1103–
1318   1119. doi:10.1534/genetics.117.300323.
1319 Teterina AA, Willis JH, Lukac M, Jovelin R, Cutter AD, Phillips PC. 2023. Genomic diversity
1320   landscapes in outcrossing and selfing *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. PLoS Genet.
1321   19(8):e1010879. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1010879.
1322 Thornton K. 2003. libsequence: a C++ class library for evolutionary genetic analysis.
1323   Bioinformatics. 19(17):2325–2327. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btg316.
1324 Vassilieva LL, Hook AM, Lynch M. 2000. The fitness effects of spontaneous mutations in
1325   *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Evolution. 54(4):1234–1246. doi:10.1111/j.0014-
1326   3820.2000.tb00557.x.
1327 Víquez-Zamora M, Caro M, Finkers R, Tikunov Y, Bovy A, Visser RG, Bai Y, van Heusden S.
1328   2014. Mapping in the era of sequencing: high density genotyping and its application for

40

mapping TYLCV resistance in *Solanum pimpinellifolium*. BMC Genom. 15(1):1152. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-15-1152.

Wade EE, Kyriazis CC, Cavassim MIA, Lohmueller KE. 2023. Quantifying the fraction of new mutations that are recessive lethal. Evolution. 77(7):1539–1549. doi:10.1093/evolut/qpad061.

Wakeley J. 1999. Nonequilibrium migration in human history. Genetics. 153(4):1863–1871. doi:10.1093/genetics/153.4.1863.

Walczak AM, Nicolaisen LE, Plotkin JB, Desai MM. 2012. The structure of genealogies in the presence of purifying selection: a fitness-class coalescent. Genetics. 190(2):753–779. doi:10.1534/genetics.111.134544.

Wang L, Zhu T, Rodriguez JC, Deal KR, Dubcovsky J, McGuire PE, Lux T, Spannagl M, Mayer KFX, Baldrich P, et al. 2021. *Aegilops tauschii* genome assembly Aet v5.0 features greater sequence contiguity and improved annotation. G3. 11(12):jkab325. doi:10.1093/g3journal/jkab325.

Watterson GA. 1975. On the number of segregating sites in genetical models without recombination. Theor Popul Biol. 7(2):256–276. doi:10.1016/0040-5809(75)90020-9.

Weinreich DM, Rand DM. 2000. Contrasting patterns of nonneutral evolution in proteins encoded in nuclear and mitochondrial genomes. Genetics. 156(1):385–399. doi:10.1093/genetics/156.1.385.

Wesse C, Welk E, Hurka H, Neuffer B. 2021. Geographical pattern of genetic diversity in *Capsella bursa-pastoris* (Brassicaceae)—A global perspective. Ecol Evol. 11(1):199–213. doi:10.1002/ece3.7010.

Willenborg CJ, Van Acker RC. 2008. The biology and ecology of hexaploid wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) and its implications for trait confinement. Can J Plant Sci. 88(5):997–1013. doi:10.4141/CJPS07144.

Williamson SH, Hernandez R, Fledel-Alon A, Zhu L, Nielsen R, Bustamante CD. 2005. Simultaneous inference of selection and population growth from patterns of variation in the human genome. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 102(22):7882–7887. doi:10.1073/pnas.0502300102.

Wloch DM, Szafraniec K, Borts RH, Korona R. 2001. Direct estimate of the mutation rate and the distribution of fitness effects in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Genetics. 159(2):441–452. doi:10.1093/genetics/159.2.441.

Wright SI, Kalisz S, Slotte T. 2013. Evolutionary consequences of self-fertilization in plants. Proc R Soc Lond B. 280(1760):20130133. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.0133.

Yang S, Wang L, Huang J, Zhang X, Yuan Y, Chen J-Q, Hurst LD, Tian D. 2015. Parent–progeny sequencing indicates higher mutation rates in heterozygotes. Nature. 523(7561):463–467. doi:10.1038/nature14649.

Zeitler L, Gilbert KJ. 2024. Using runs of homozygosity and machine learning to disentangle sources of inbreeding and infer self-fertilization rates. Genome Biol Evol. 16(7):evae139. doi:10.1093/gbe/evae139.

Zeng K, Charlesworth B. 2011. The joint effects of background selection and genetic recombination on local gene genealogies. Genetics. 189(1):251–266. doi:10.1534/genetics.111.130575.

Zeng K, Corcoran P. 2015. The effects of background and interference selection on patterns of genetic variation in subdivided populations. Genetics. 201(4):1539–1554. doi:10.1534/genetics.115.178558.

1375
1376

1377
Figure 1: Effects of selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). (**A**) The mean selection coefficients ($\overline{s_d}$) and (**B**) shape parameters (β) of the inferred gamma distributions for varying selfing rates are shown. (C) A comparison of the simulated and inferred DFE at 99% selfing rate is shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in the effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes of mutations. The simulated (black bars) and adjusted (grey bars) DFE represents the distribution of $2Ns_d$ and $2NBs_d$ respectively. (**D**) The simulated and inferred distribution of s_d, which was created by dividing the mean of the gamma distribution ($2N_e\overline{s_d}$) by $2BN$. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in **C** and **D**. In all panels, the error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

42

Figure 2: Effects of reduced recombination rates on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). (**A**) The mean selection coefficients ($\overline{s_d}$) and (**B**) shape parameters (β) of the inferred gamma distributions are plotted for varying recombination rates, reduced from an initial rate of $r = 3.12 \times 10^{-8}$ per site/generation. (**C**) A comparison of the simulated and inferred DFE at a recombination rate reduced by 99.9% is shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes of mutations. The simulated (black bars) and adjusted (grey bars) DFE represents the distribution of $2Ns_d$ and $2NBs_d$ respectively. (**D**) The simulated and inferred distribution of s_d, which was created by dividing the mean of the gamma distribution ($2N_e s_d$) by $2BN$. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in **C** and **D**. In all panels, the error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

1405
1406

Figure 3: Correlation of error ($\varepsilon = \left|\frac{inferred-true}{true}\right|$) of parameters in DFE inference by DFE-alpha with (**A**) the ratio of number of deleterious mutations per diploid genome per generation (U_d) and number of effective recombination events per individual per generation (R) and (**B**) the neutral nucleotide site diversity (B) with background selection relative to that expected under neutrality (B). Error in the inference of the parameters of the DFE and levels of background selection were averaged over five independent replicates.

44

Figure 4: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles from 100 genomes sampled from simulations where all selected mutations were deleterious, for the moderately deleterious DFE (DFE2). For **(A)** the y-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given derived allele count. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-99. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. For **(B)** the y-axis is plotted on a log scale, with all derived allele counts displayed. Lines were smoothed with LOESS.

Figure 5: Effects of selfing on the SFS and linkage disequilibrium (LD) at neutral (red lines) and selected (blue lines) sites. The skew in the SFS was quantified using $\Delta\theta$ for DFE1 (**A**), DFE2 (**C**), and DFE3 (**E**), calculated using alleles at all frequencies, while LD was summarized by the statistic D' for DFE1 (**B**), DFE2 (**D**), and DFE3 (**F**), calculated for alleles at frequencies of 1%-5%. The error bars denote the standard deviation of the genome-wide average of each summary statistic estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Figure 6: Effects of selfing on the inference of (A) the DFE of new deleterious mutations and (**B**) the proportion of beneficial fixations (α) using GRAPES (shown in purple bars). (**A**) Here the DFE is displayed as the distribution of s_d, which was created by dividing the mean of the gamma distribution ($2N_e s_d$) by $2(\pi_{obs}/\pi_{exp})N$, where π_{obs} is the neutral nucleotide site diversity observed in each scenario and π_{exp} is the neutral nucleotide site diversity expected in a population of size N at strict neutrality. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral ($0 \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-4}$), weakly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-4} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-3}$), moderately deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-3} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-2}$) and strongly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-2} \leq s_d < 1$) classes. Selfing rates were varied between 0 and 99 %. π/π_0, the neutral nucleotide diversity with selection relative to that expected under neutrality is shown. For both (**A**) and (**B**), 0.1% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

47

Figure 7: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes such that the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing and $N_{deme}m$ was 0.1. Results are shown for the most weakly deleterious DFE (*i.e.*, DFE1). The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. Rows represent the sampling scheme for genomes, where sampling was even, sampling was primarily from one deme, or sampling was primarily from two demes.

1459 **Table 1**: Parameters of the simulated DFEs of deleterious mutations in terms of the proportion of
1460 mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and
1461 strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. DFEs consisted of predominantly mildly deleterious (DFE1),
1462 moderately deleterious (DFE2), or strongly deleterious (DFE3) mutations.

	β	$2Ns_d$	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3
DFE1	0.9	5	0.204	0.655	0.140	0.000
DFE2	0.5	50	0.113	0.233	0.497	0.157
DFE3	0.3	1000	0.098	0.097	0.192	0.614

1463

1464 **Table 2:** Estimated levels of background selection (B) in highly selfing species for the range of
1465 previously reported selfing rates. All species are diploid except tetraploid *C. bursa-pastoris*. U_d
1466 is the number of deleterious mutations per diploid genome per generation, while R is the map
1467 length in Morgans for each genome. The strength of BGS was calculated with $B = \exp\left(-\frac{U_d}{R_{self}}\right)$,
1468 where $R_{self} = R \times F$. All mutation rates, recombination rates, and genome annotation
1469 information used to construct this table is present in Supplementary Table 9.

Species	Coding fraction (f_{coding})	$\frac{U_d}{R}$	Selfing rate	$\frac{U_d}{R_{self}}$	Estimated B	References
*Aegilops tauschii**	0.01	0.022	0.90-0.995	0.25-4.45	0.01-0.78	(Willenborg and Van Acker 2008; Luo et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2021; Burgarella et al. 2024)
Arabidopsis thaliana	0.27	0.071	0.97-0.99	1.32-3.89	0.02-0.27	(Snape and Lawrence 1971; Singer et al. 2006; Ossowski et al. 2010; Cheng et al. 2017)
Caenorhabditis briggsae+	0.22	0.031	0.95-0.999	0.33-15.50	~0-0.72	(Zeitler and Gilbert 2024)
Caenorhabditis elegans	0.3	0.042	0.93-0.999	0.32-21.00	~0-0.73	(*C. elegans* Sequencing Consortium 1998; Denver et al. 2004; Saxena et al. 2019; Teterina et al. 2023)
Capsella bursa-pastoris+	0.21	0.077	0.90-0.99	0.42-3.87	0.02-0.66	(Linde et al. 2001: 200; Wesse et al. 2021; Penin et al. 2024)
Capsella orientalis+	0.24	0.086	0.90-0.99	0.48-4.36	0.01-0.62	(Ågren et al. 2014)
Medicago truncatula	0.13	0.096	0.92-0.95	0.65-1.01	0.36-0.52	(Maureira-Butler et al. 2008; Gorton et al. 2012; Pruitt et al. 2014; Jullien et al. 2021)
Oryza sativa (indica)	0.12	0.017	0.95-0.99	0.17-0.83	0.43-0.84	(Pruitt et al. 2014; Yang et al. 2015: 20; De Leon et al. 2016; Bah et al. 2017)
Solanum lycopersicon	0.06	0.029	0.948-0.999	0.29-14.10	~0-0.75	(Roselius et al. 2005; Víquez-Zamora et al. 2014; Horneburg and Becker 2018; Su et al. 2021)
*Triticum urartu**+	0.08	0.026	0.90-0.991	0.14-1.45	0.23-0.87	(Willenborg and Van Acker 2008; Ling et al. 2018; Burgarella et al. 2024)

1470 * mutation rate estimate of closely related species used for calculations (*A. thaliana* for plants, *C.*
1471 *elegans* for *C. briggsae*)
1472 +recombination rate of closely related species used for calculations

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES AND TABLES

Supplementary Figure 1: Effects of selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Selfing rates were varied between 0 and 99 %. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The simulated (black bars) and adjusted (grey bars) DFE represents the distribution of $2Ns_d$ and $2NBs_d$ respectively. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 2: Effects of selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). Here the DFE is displayed as the distribution of s_d, which was created by dividing the mean of the gamma distribution ($2N_e s_d$) by $2BN$. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral ($0 \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-4}$), weakly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-4} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-3}$), moderately deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-3} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-2}$) and strongly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-2} \leq s_d < \infty$) classes. Selfing rates were varied between 0 and 99 %. The black bars represent the simulated distribution of s_d. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 3: Inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations in partially selfing populations using DFE-alpha and GRAPES for simulations with no linkage. Here, 50,000 selected mutations were simulated individually (as single locus simulations) in various selfing rates without linkage to other selected mutations. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes.

Supplementary Figure 4: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles in partially selfing populations from single-site simulations. 100 genomes were sampled and all selected mutations were additive and deleterious The *y*-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given allele-count class. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-100. The SFS of neutral sites is shown in red, while the SFS of selected sites in simulations with 0%, 50%, and 99% selfing are shown as green, blue, and purple bars respectively.

Supplementary Figure 5: (A) The SFS at neutral (blue) and selected (red) sites when 50 diploid individuals are sampled (instead of 100 random genomes). (B) The accuracy of DFE inference when 50 diploid individuals are sampled (instead of 100 random genomes). Results are shown for a predominantly moderately deleterious DFE (DFE2). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 6: Effects of low recombination rate on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Recombination rates were varied between $0.5 \times$ mean and $0.001 \times$ mean, where the mean recombination rate was 3.12×10^{-8} per site/generations. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The simulated DFE (shown in black) and adjusted DFE (shown in grey) represents the distribution of $2Ns_d$ and $2NBs_d$ respectively. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 7: Effects of low recombination rate on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). Here the DFE is displayed as the distribution of s_d, which was created by dividing the mean of the gamma distribution ($2N_e s_d$) by $2BN$. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral ($0 \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-4}$), weakly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-4} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-3}$), moderately deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-3} \leq s_d < 1 \times 10^{-2}$) and strongly deleterious ($1 \times 10^{-2} \leq s_d < \infty$) classes. Recombination rates were varied between $0.5 \times$ mean and $0.001 \times$ mean, where the mean recombination rate was 3.12×10^{-8} per site/generations. The black bars represent the simulated distribution of s_d. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 8: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles from 100 genomes sampled from simulations where all selected mutations were deleterious, for the weakly deleterious DFE. For **(A)** the y-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given derived allele count. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-99. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. For **(B)** the y-axis is plotted on a log scale, with all derived allele counts displayed. Lines were smoothed with LOESS.

Supplementary Figure 9: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles from 100 genomes sampled from simulations where all selected mutations were deleterious, for the strongly deleterious DFE. For **(A)** the y-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given derived allele count. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-99. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. For **(B)** the y-axis is plotted on a log scale, with all derived allele counts displayed. Lines were smoothed with LOESS.

Supplementary Figure 10: Effects of low recombination on the SFS and linkage disequilibrium (LD) at neutral (red lines) and selected (blue lines) sites. The skew in the SFS was quantified using $\Delta\theta$ for DFE1 (**A**), DFE2 (**C**), and DFE3 (**E**), calculated using alleles at all frequencies, while LD was summarized by the statistic D' for DFE1 (**B**), DFE2 (**D**), and DFE3 (**F**), calculated for alleles at frequencies of 1%-5%. The error bars denote the standard deviation of the genome-wide average of each summary statistic estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 11: Correlation of error in inference of the parameters $2Ns$ (**A**) and β (**B**) by DFE-alpha with various summary statistics calculated by pylibseq. Data points represent the average error and statistic value averaged over five replicates. The skew in the SFS was quantified using π (per site), θ_H (per site), and singleton density ($sing$), while LD was summarized by the statistics haplotype diversity ($hapdiv$), D, and r^2 using minor alleles across the window. Most statistics were calculated in 5000 bp windows for all allele frequencies, and values for nonsynonymous sites were divided by synonymous sites. However, D and r^2 were calculated for only nonsynonymous alleles at frequencies of 1%-5%.

Supplementary Figure 12: Effects of varying the rescaling factor on the estimated DFE of new deleterious mutations in partially selfing organisms using DFE-alpha and GRAPES at selfing rates of (**A**) 95% and (**B**) 99%. The rescaling factors were reduced from the original 100 to 50, 20, and 10 (denoted on top of the columns). The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates, except for the rescaling factor of 10, where only one replicate of DFE3 at 95% selfing and three replicates each for DFE2 and DFE3 at 99% selfing were completed.

Supplementary Figure 13: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles from 100 genomes sampled from simulations with 99% selfing where all selected mutations were deleterious, with varying rescaling factors plotted on the x-axis. The y-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given derived allele count. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-99. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates, except for the rescaling factor of 10, where only three replicates each for DFE2 and DFE3 were completed.

Supplementary Figure 14: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles from 100 genomes sampled from simulations where all selected mutations were deleterious, with varying rescaling factors plotted on the x-axis. The y-axis is plotted on a log scale, with all derived allele counts (frequencies 1-99) displayed. Lines were smoothed with LOESS.

Supplementary Figure 15: The inference of the deleterious DFE when varying chromosome sizes were simulated: a chromosome with 500 genes (shown in darker shades) vs a chromosome with 3000 genes (shown in lighter shades). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The adjusted DFE represents the distribution of $2NBs_d$. Inference was performed using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES purple bars). The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 16: Effects of varying the coding density on the estimated DFE of new deleterious mutations in partially selfing organisms using DFE-alpha and GRAPES at selfing rates of (**A**) 0%, (**B**) 50%, and (**C**) 99%. The intergenic regions were reduced from the original 3000 bp to 1500 bp and 500 bp (denoted on top of the columns). The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 17: Effects of selfing on DFE inference of new deleterious mutations with varying dominance coefficients using DFE-alpha (red bars) and GRAPES (purple bars). The dominance of selected mutations is noted at the top of each column. Results are shown for populations with (**A**) 0% selfing and (**B**) 99% selfing. Here the effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes represent $0 < 2N_{self}s_dh_{self} < 1$, $1 < 2N_{self}s_dh_{self} < 10$, $10 < 2N_{self}s_dh_{self} < 100$, and $100 < 2N_{self}s_dh_{self} < 2N_{self}$, respectively. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 18: Effects of selfing (50%) on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations with varying dominance coefficients using DFE-alpha and GRAPES. The dominance of all new mutations is noted at the top of each column. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 19: Site frequency spectra of neutral and selected alleles for varying rates of selfing, dominance coefficients, and deleterious DFEs. 100 genomes were sampled from simulations. Selected mutations had a dominance coefficient $h = 0.25$ or 0.5. The y-axis represents the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given allele-frequency class. The last class (11+) refers to the derived allele counts 11-100.

Supplementary Figure 20: Effects of selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha and GRAPES (shown in purple bars). Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The adjusted DFE represents the distribution of $2N(\pi_{obs}/\pi_{exp})s_d$, where π_{obs} is the neutral nucleotide site diversity observed in each scenario and π_{exp} is the neutral nucleotide site diversity expected in a population of size N at strict neutrality. 0.1% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$. Here, the unfolded SFS was used for inference. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 21: Effects of selfing on the inference of (A) the DFE of new deleterious mutations and (B) the proportion of beneficial fixations (α) using DFE-alpha and GRAPES when beneficial mutations are common (1%). Results for A are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Here, 1.0% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$. Here, the unfolded SFS was used for inference. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 22: Site frequency spectra of neutral vs selected sites when a full DFE was simulated (*i.e.*, both deleterious and beneficial mutations were present). 100 genomes were sampled and the y-axis depicts the proportion of segregating polymorphisms that fall into the given allele-count class. Panel **A** shows simulations where 0.1% of new mutations at selected sites were beneficial and Panel **B** shows simulations where 1% of new mutations at selected sites were beneficial. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 23: Effects of selfing on the inference of (A) the DFE of new deleterious mutations and (B) the proportion of beneficial fixations (α) using DFE-alpha and GRAPES, when beneficial mutations were rare. Results for A are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Here, 0.1% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$. Here, the folded SFS was used for inference. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 24: Effects of selfing on the inference of (A) the DFE of new deleterious mutations and (B) the proportion of beneficial fixations (α) using DFE-alpha and GRAPES, when beneficial mutations were common. Results for A are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. Here, 1.0% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$. Here, the folded SFS was used for inference. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 25: Effects of population structure and selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha and GRAPES. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled evenly from each deme. Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was (**A**) 2 (**B**) 1, (**C**) 0.5, and (**D**) 0.1. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The adjusted DFE represents the distribution of $2NBs_d$. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 26: Effects of population structure and selfing on the SFS. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled evenly from each deme. Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was (**A**) 2 (**B**) 1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 27: Effects of population structure and selfing on the SFS with even sampling. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled evenly from each deme. Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was (**A**) 0.5 (**B**) 0.1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 28: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the SFS at high migration rates. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (60 genomes from one deme, and 10 from the remaining four demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was (**A**) 2 (**B**) 1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 29: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the SFS at lower migration rates. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (60 genomes from one deme, and 10 from the remaining four demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was **(A)** 0.5 **(B)** 0.1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 30: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the SFS at high migration rates. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (35 genomes from two demes, and 10 from the remaining four demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was (**A**) 2 (**B**) 1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 31: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the SFS when rates of migration are low. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (35 genomes from two demes, and 10 from the remaining four demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was **(A)** 0.5 **(B)** 0.1. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates. The last class (26+) refers to the derived allele counts 26-100.

Supplementary Figure 32: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure, and selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha and GRAPES. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (60 genomes from one deme, and 10 from the remaining four demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was **(A)** 2 **(B)** 1, **(C)** 0.5, and **(D)** 0.1. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The adjusted DFE represents the distribution of $2NBs_d$. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Figure 33: Effects of uneven sampling, population structure and selfing on the inference of the DFE of new deleterious mutations using DFE-alpha and GRAPES. Populations were simulated under an island model with five demes, and genomes were sampled unevenly (35 genomes from two demes, and 10 from the remaining three demes). Here the metapopulation effective size was equal to 5000 at 0% selfing (see methods). Results are shown when $N_{deme}m$ was **(A)** 2 **(B)** 1, **(C)** 0.5, and **(D)** 0.1. Results are shown in terms of the proportion of mutations in effectively neutral (f_0), weakly deleterious (f_1), moderately deleterious (f_2) and strongly deleterious (f_3) classes. The nucleotide site diversity with background selection (B) relative to its expectation under strict neutrality is shown in each panel. The adjusted DFE represents the distribution of $2NBs_d$. The error bars denote the standard deviation of proportions estimated from 5 independent replicates.

Supplementary Table 1 Effects of selfing on the mean values of parameters of the DFE of new deleterious mutations, estimated by DFE-alpha. Here $E[s]$ represents the mean efficacy of selection, before being scaled by a 2-epoch model of population size change, where $N1$ represents the ancestral population size, $N2$ represents the relative population size after the first epoch, and $t2$ represents the duration of time after the population size change (in generations).

	Selfing rate	$E[s]$	$N1$	$N2$	$t2$
DFE1	Truth	-0.025	100	NA	NA
	0%	-0.027	100	145	16
	50%	-0.025	100	153	7
	80%	-0.021	100	162	5
	90%	-0.023	100	150	17
	95%	-0.019	100	179	29
	99%	-0.013	100	394	77
DFE2	Truth	-0.25	100	100	NA
	0%	-0.269	100	158	5
	50%	-0.263	100	150	6
	80%	-0.223	100	168	5
	90%	-0.187	100	238	5
	95%	-0.099	100	322	22
	99%	-0.026	100	1000	57
DFE3	Truth	-5	100	100	NA
	0%	-4.712	100	144	5
	50%	-5.465	100	156	5
	80%	-4.62	100	162	5
	90%	-2.665	100	198	11
	95%	-1.722	100	319	17
	99%	-0.687	100	798	59

Supplementary Table 2 Estimated parameter values of the deleterious DFE by GRAPES and DFE-alpha for simulations with only semi-dominant deleterious mutations.

| | | β | | | | $2N_e s_d$ | | | |
| | | GRAPES | | DFE-alpha | | GRAPES | | DFE-alpha | |
	Selfing rate	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
DFE1	Truth	0.9	0	0.9	0	5	0	5	0
	0%	0.77	0.16	0.74	0.04	5.43	0.58	5.4	0.33
	50%	0.85	0.09	0.82	0.16	4.97	0.15	5.12	0.5
	80%	0.93	0.30	1	0.29	4.5	0.81	4.27	0.59
	90%	0.65	0.11	0.78	0.16	5.25	1.07	4.8	0.92
	95%	0.57	0.15	0.68	0.14	4.42	0.39	4	0.48
	99%	0.34	0.03	0.26	0.03	2.34	0.59	3.2	0.9
DFE2	Truth	0.5	0	0.5	0	50	0	50	0
	0%	0.50	0.01	0.48	0.01	50.6	4.12	54.23	5.35
	50%	0.48	0.04	0.47	0.02	52	6.64	53.12	3.45
	80%	0.49	0.06	0.48	0.03	44.4	7.33	45.14	3.73
	90%	0.45	0.05	0.47	0.03	41.87	10.37	37.87	6.4
	95%	0.39	0.07	0.46	0.07	29.44	9.1	21.12	5.89
	99%	0.33	0.15	0.35	0.04	8.93	1.38	6.39	1.41
DFE3	Truth	0.3	0	0.3	0	1000	0	1000	0
	0%	0.32	0.02	0.3	0.01	627.15	107.89	949.56	138.64
	50%	0.30	0.02	0.29	0.02	730.72	133.39	1102.76	243.83
	80%	0.30	0.05	0.29	0.03	743.11	415.73	933.55	448.17
	90%	0.28	0.04	0.29	0.01	663.41	468.89	546.89	156.22
	95%	0.26	0.04	0.28	0.01	512.23	233.45	363.49	62.58
	99%	0.17	0.06	0.26	0.03	619.02	344.14	171.07	99.41

Supplementary Table 3 The number of segregating sites and reduction in population size due to BGS and selfing for varying selfing rates and DFEs as observed in our simulations. Here N=5000 and $B = \pi_{neu}/(4N_{self}\mu)$, where μ is the mutation rate per site/generation.

	Selfing rate	Number of deleterious segregating sites		π_{neu}	N_{emp}	N_{self}	B
		mean	SD				
DFE1	0%	13564	137	0.00626	4746	5000	0.949
	50%	10077	121	0.00464	3512	3750	0.936
	80%	7950	112	0.00352	2664	3000	0.888
	90%	6997	131	0.00299	2264	2750	0.823
	95%	6260	190	0.00244	1850	2625	0.705
	99%	4281	293	0.0011	835	2525	0.331
DFE2	0%	7930	103	0.00614	4654	5000	0.931
	50%	5837	105	0.00448	3392	3750	0.905
	80%	4463	95	0.00322	2440	3000	0.813
	90%	3559	137	0.00225	1706	2750	0.620
	95%	2656	244	0.00114	865	2625	0.329
	99%	1628	135	0.00028	212	2525	0.084
DFE3	0%	4273	49	0.0059	4470	5000	0.894
	50%	3003	36	0.00406	3078	3750	0.821
	80%	2048	68	0.00257	1946	3000	0.649
	90%	1602	25	0.00165	1254	2750	0.456
	95%	1213	54	0.00097	737	2625	0.281
	99%	818	69	0.00032	241	2525	0.096

Supplementary Table 4 Nucleotide site diversity (π) from single-site simulations of neutral and semidominant deleterious mutations in populations with varying selfing rates.

	Selfing rate	Theoretical π at neutral sites	Simulation π at neutral sites
DFE1	0	0.00660	0.00653
DFE2	0	0.00660	0.00653
DFE3	0	0.00660	0.00653
DFE1	0.50	0.00495	0.00499
DFE2	0.50	0.00495	0.00499
DFE3	0.50	0.00495	0.00499
DFE1	0.99	0.00333	0.00321
DFE2	0.99	0.00333	0.00321
DFE3	0.99	0.00333	0.00321

Supplementary Table 5 Estimates of the parameters of the deleterious DFE (a gamma distribution with mean $\gamma = 2N_e\overline{s_d}$ and shape parameter β) inferred by DFE-alpha and GRAPES. Since DFE-alpha and GRAPES assume semidominance, the mean strength of selection γ was multiplied by 0.5 to be equivalent to $2N_{self}s_d h_{self}$.

DFE	Selfing rate	$2N_{self}s_d h_{self}$ (expected)	DFE-alpha γh	GRAPES γh	β (expected)	DFE-alpha β	GRAPES β	h
DFE1	0	3.75	4.29	4.33	0.9	0.62	0.64	0.75
DFE1	0.50	4.04	3.32	3.49	0.9	0.68	0.66	0.75
DFE1	0.99	4.17	1.40	1.01	0.9	0.42	0.34	0.75
DFE2	0	37.5	41.45	34.99	0.5	0.44	0.48	0.75
DFE2	0.50	40.38	30.68	27.77	0.5	0.46	0.49	0.75
DFE2	0.99	41.67	4.23	4.54	0.5	0.30	0.19	0.75
DFE3	0	750.00	791.63	493.84	0.3	0.29	0.31	0.75
DFE3	0.50	807.69	630.82	429.23	0.3	0.28	0.30	0.75
DFE3	0.99	833.32	50.93	222.49	0.3	0.29	0.18	0.75
DFE1	0	2.50	2.70	2.71	0.9	0.74	0.77	0.50
DFE1	0.50	3.08	2.56	2.48	0.9	0.82	0.85	0.50
DFE1	0.99	3.33	1.60	1.17	0.9	0.26	0.34	0.50
DFE2	0	25.00	27.11	25.30	0.5	0.48	0.49	0.50
DFE2	0.50	30.77	26.56	26.00	0.5	0.47	0.48	0.50
DFE2	0.99	33.33	3.19	4.46	0.5	0.35	0.33	0.50
DFE3	0	500.00	474.78	313.57	0.3	0.30	0.32	0.50
DFE3	0.50	615.38	551.38	365.36	0.3	0.29	0.30	0.50
DFE3	0.99	666.64	85.53	309.51	0.3	0.26	0.17	0.50
DFE1	0	1.25	1.28	1.33	0.9	2.66	2.07	0.25
DFE1	0.50	2.12	1.66	1.74	0.9	1.54	1.49	0.25
DFE1	0.99	2.50	1.56	0.98	0.9	0.32	0.39	0.25
DFE2	0	12.50	10.73	10.62	0.5	0.63	0.64	0.25
DFE2	0.50	21.15	18.06	15.95	0.5	0.51	0.56	0.25
DFE2	0.99	25.00	4.50	4.65	0.5	0.29	0.20	0.25
DFE3	0	250.00	263.78	217.20	0.3	0.31	0.31	0.25
DFE3	0.50	423.08	316.34	253.83	0.3	0.31	0.32	0.25
DFE3	0.99	499.97	54.93	183.24	0.3	0.28	0.25	0.25
DFE1	0	0.50	0.91	0.88	0.9	100	16.45	0.10
DFE1	0.50	1.54	1.24	1.31	0.9	3.44	9.15	0.10
DFE1	0.99	2.00	1.32	0.84	0.9	0.40	0.36	0.10
DFE2	0	5.00	4.54	4.92	0.5	1.05	0.94	0.10
DFE2	0.50	15.38	12.19	12.42	0.5	0.58	0.56	0.10
DFE2	0.99	20.00	5.02	6.41	0.5	0.32	0.22	0.10
DFE3	0	100.00	69.53	63.27	0.3	0.38	0.39	0.10
DFE3	0.50	307.69	192.87	159.62	0.3	0.33	0.33	0.10
DFE3	0.99	399.96	72.07	213.35	0.3	0.26	0.19	0.10

Supplementary Table 6 Effects of selfing on the number of fixations of deleterious and beneficial mutations. Here, deleterious mutations were drawn from the DFEs defined in Table 1, while 0.1% of new exonic mutations were beneficial and exponentially distributed with a mean $2Ns_a = 200$.

Selfing rate	DFE	Deleterious substitutions avg.	Deleterious substitutions SD	Beneficial substitutions avg.	Beneficial substitutions SD	α avg.	α SD
0	DFE1	1438.4	31.48	935.8	32.09	0.39	0.01
50	DFE1	1514.2	56.92	912.2	30.19	0.38	0.01
80	DFE1	1820.8	28.03	813.4	17.9	0.31	0.01
90	DFE1	2253.6	68.2	681.8	14.75	0.23	0.01
95	DFE1	2785	77.11	552.4	19.55	0.17	0
99	DFE1	3363.8	56.91	343.4	15.53	0.09	0
0	DFE2	618.2	7.82	912	40.21	0.6	0.01
50	DFE2	682	28.57	878.2	33.25	0.56	0.01
80	DFE2	810	46.98	753.4	33.07	0.48	0.02
90	DFE2	1087.4	31.5	617.6	20.02	0.36	0.01
95	DFE2	1451.2	28.01	464	5.7	0.24	0
99	DFE2	2133	26.54	276.6	7.83	0.11	0
0	DFE3	460.8	11.76	869.2	24.38	0.65	0.01
50	DFE3	509	16.39	806.6	25.75	0.61	0.01
80	DFE3	543.2	27.22	620.6	18.99	0.53	0.01
90	DFE3	635.6	34.25	464.8	25.96	0.42	0.01
95	DFE3	762.2	24.94	341.4	20.95	0.31	0.02
99	DFE3	1040.8	36.62	191.6	18.77	0.16	0.01

Supplementary Table 7 Parameters used for five-deme island model simulations.

$N_{deme}m$	m	N_{deme}
10	0.0102	984
2	0.00216	926
1	0.00116	862
0.5	0.00066	785
0.1	0.00026	385

Supplementary Table 8 Table showing how theoretical expectations for T_T, T_S, and F_{st} match values estimated from neutral simulations.

$N_{deme}m$	Selfing rate	π_{meta} expected	π_{meta} observed	π_{deme} expected	π_{deme} observed	F_{st} expected	F_{st} observed
0.1	0	0.00660	0.00659	0.00254	0.00259	0.61515	0.60713
0.1	0.50	0.00597	0.00599	0.00191	0.00211	0.68063	0.64825
0.1	0.99	0.00534	0.00567	0.00128	0.00140	0.75991	0.76400
0.5	0	0.00678	0.00661	0.00518	0.00507	0.23595	0.23265
0.5	0.50	0.00549	0.00537	0.00389	0.00375	0.29166	0.30229
0.5	0.99	0.00422	0.00425	0.00262	0.00291	0.37947	0.31402
1.0	0	0.00660	0.00659	0.00569	0.00564	0.13794	0.14426
1.0	0.50	0.00518	0.00519	0.00427	0.00434	0.17584	0.16317
1.0	0.99	0.00378	0.00402	0.00287	0.00305	0.24062	0.24016
2.0	0	0.00660	0.00657	0.00611	0.00611	0.07407	0.06951
2.0	0.50	0.00507	0.00508	0.00458	0.00457	0.09638	0.09950
2.0	0.99	0.00358	0.00345	0.00309	0.00295	0.13674	0.14377

Supplementary Table 9 Estimated levels of background selection (B) in highly selfing species for the range of previously reported selfing rates. All species are diploid except *C. bursa-pastoris*. The number of deleterious mutations per genome per generation (U_d) was estimated by multiplying the number of coding sites by 0.7. The strength of BGS was calculated with $B = \exp\left(-\frac{U_d}{R_{self}}\right)$, where $R_{self} = R \times F$. This supplementary table contains all mutation and recombination rate data used for the calculations in Table 2 of the main text.

(table stored in a separate attachment)