Figure a shows the rate of losing a TFBS as a function of selection strength and the number of mismatches. The graph compares different scenarios:

- Blue line: \( k=2, \theta=0.15 \) (point & indel)
- Red line: \( k=0, \theta=0.15 \) (point & indel)
- Dotted blue line: \( k=2, \theta=0 \) (point)
- Dotted red line: \( k=0, \theta=0 \) (point)
- Dotted black line: approx., \( \theta=0 \) (point)

Each line represents a different scenario, with the legend indicating the values of \( k \) and \( \theta \). The x-axis represents the selection strength \(-Ns\), and the y-axis represents the rate of losing a TFBS. The inset graphs provide a closer view of the rate of losing a TFBS for different values of \( k \) and \( \theta \).

Figure b illustrates the relationship between binding length \( n \) and specificity \( \epsilon \) for the scenario \( 1/\langle t \rangle_{W \leftarrow k=0, \theta=0} \). The graph shows how specificity changes with binding length, with markers indicating specific values of \( Ns \).

Figure c continues this trend, showing the specificity-\( \epsilon \) relationship for \( 1/\langle t \rangle_{W \leftarrow k=0, \theta=0.15} \), with markers indicating \( Ns \) values of \(-1.68\) and \(-3.61\) Nsu.