

Evolutionary prisoner's dilemma games with optional participation

György Szabó

Research Institute for Technical Physics and Materials Science P.O.Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary

Christoph Hauert

Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia,
6270 University Boulevard, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1Z4

(Dated: March 22, 2022)

Competition among cooperators, defectors, and loners is studied in an evolutionary prisoner's dilemma game with optional participation. Loners are risk averse i.e. unwilling to participate and rather rely on small but fixed earnings. This results in a rock-scissors-paper type cyclic dominance of the three strategies. The players are located either on square lattices or random regular graphs with the same connectivity. Occasionally, every player reassesses its strategy by sampling the payoffs in its neighborhood. The loner strategy efficiently prevents successful spreading of selfish, defective behavior and avoids deadlocks in states of mutual defection. On square lattices, Monte Carlo simulations reveal self-organizing patterns driven by the cyclic dominance, whereas on random regular graphs different types of oscillatory behavior are observed: the temptation to defect determines whether damped, periodic or increasing oscillations occur. These results are compared to predictions by pair approximation. Although pair approximation is incapable of distinguishing the two scenarios because of the equal connectivity, the average frequencies as well as the oscillations on random regular graphs are well reproduced.

I. INTRODUCTION

Evolutionary prisoner's dilemma games (PDG) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] were introduced to study the emergence and maintenance of cooperation among selfish individuals in societies where strategies are either inherited or adopted through basic imitation rules. In the original PDG [6] two players simultaneously decide whether to cooperate or defect. Mutual cooperation (defection) yields the highest (lowest) *collective* payoff which is shared equally. However, still higher *individual* payoffs are achieved by defectors facing cooperators leaving the latter with the lowest possible payoff. Thus, defection is dominant because they fare better (or at least equal) regardless of the co-players decision. Consequentially, 'rational' players always end up with the lowest collective payoff instead of the higher reward for mutual cooperation.

Obviously, this result is at odds with observations in human and animal societies. Indeed, cooperation may emerge under certain circumstances (see e.g. [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]). In well-mixed populations, i.e. with random matchings, cooperative strategies succeed provided that interactions between the same individuals are repeated with sufficiently high probability. Computer tournaments [4, 13] emphasized the importance of particularly simple strategies such as D (always defect), C (always cooperate), and T ("tit for tat", cooperate on the first move and then repeat the co-player's move).

In spatially extended systems with limited local interaction, cooperators may thrive by forming clusters [11, 14, 15] and thereby reducing exploitation by defectors. For example, on square lattices with C, D strategies and suitable parameter values, clusters of cooperators typically expand along straight boundaries while being invaded by defectors along corners and irregular boundaries. The competition between these two invasion processes maintains persistent co-existence of both strategies. When tuning the model parameters, universal phase transitions between states of homogenous defection, co-existence and mutual cooperation are observed [16, 17].

Very recently the analysis is extended to diluted lattices [18] and to adaptive networks [19].

The dynamics of such spatial evolutionary PDG becomes increasingly complex if players can adopt three or more strategies [20, 21, 22]. In particular, the crucial role of the T strategy is confirmed [23, 24]. For example, in an externally driven system supplying C, i.e. nourishing defectors, cooperative behavior persists through the cyclic dominance of D, C, and T which maintains self-organizing domain structures [25, 26, 27].

In this work, we consider another PDG with three strategies by allowing for optional participation. Players can adopt the C and D strategies mentioned above or decline participation relying on some small but fixed source of income. Such risk averse players are termed loners (L).

Voluntary participation in public goods games [10, 28] turned out to be an efficient way to prevent and avoid the tragedy of the commons [29]. This system has an inherent cyclic dominance resulting in periodic oscillations in well-mixed populations [30] and self-organizing polydomain structures on square lattices [31]. However note that the former case requires group sizes larger than pairs i.e. excluding the PDG. Pairwise interactions invariably lead to homogenous states of loners. In sharp contrast, we demonstrate that cooperative behavior persists on square lattices producing self-organizing patterns whereas varying types of oscillations occur on random regular graphs (RRG) emphasizing the importance of topological characteristics. RRGs represent a natural choice for social networks relevant in human behavior as well as economic interactions where the geometrical location hardly matters.

II. THE MODELS

We consider the evolutionary PDG in large populations with N players in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ for different geome-

tries: First, we briefly review the results for well-mixed populations i.e. the mean-field approximation. Second, the players are arranged on a square lattice and interact only with their four nearest neighbors to the north, east, south and west. Finally, the players are located on a RRG with fixed connectivity ($z = 4$) excluding double or self-connectivities. Therefore, each player has the same number of neighbors as its counterpart on the square lattice. Note that locally a RRG is similar to a tree (or Bethe-lattice) because the average loop size increases with N [32]. Since boundary problems render Bethe-lattices unsuitable for Monte Carlo (MC) simulations, RRGs serve as suitable substitutes. In addition, the analysis of branching annihilating random walks has justified the validity of pair approximation on RRG [33].

Each player follows one of three strategies, namely defection D , cooperation C , and loner L , denoted by a three-component unit vector:

$$s(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad (1)$$

The total payoff $m(x)$ for the player located on site x is specified by

$$m(x) = \sum_{\langle x \rangle} s^T(x) M s(x + \langle x \rangle); \quad (2)$$

where $s^T(x)$ denotes the transpose of $s(x)$ and the summation runs over the four nearest neighbors ($\langle x \rangle$) as defined by the geometry under consideration. Following [11], the payoff matrix M is given by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (3)$$

where b ($1 < b < 2$) determines the temptation to defect. Loners and their co-players invariably obtain the fixed payoff $0 < \dots < 1$, i.e. they perform better than two defectors but are worse off than cooperative pairs.

Randomly chosen players are allowed to reassess and modify their strategy. For example, the player at site x adopts the strategy of one of its (randomly chosen) neighbors y with a probability

$$W[s(x) \rightarrow s(y)] = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[(m(x) - m(y))K]}; \quad (4)$$

where K introduces some noise that occasionally leads to irrational decisions.

The imitation rule or learning mechanism (4) leads to three trivial unstable fixed points, namely the homogenous C , D and L states. The highest average payoff ($m_C = 4$) is achieved if everybody cooperates but this state is vulnerable to exploitation. For sufficiently large b the appearance of a single defector suffices for cooperation to break down. The system then evolves into a homogenous D state with the lowest average payoff ($m_D = 0$). Loners may in turn invade this state and




FIG. 1: Time evolution of states in mean-field approximation for $b = 1.5$, $K = 0.1$ and $\dots = 0.3$.

thereby provide an escape hatch out of states of mutual defection. Eventually a homogenous L state is reached with an average payoff $m_L = 4$. Note that solitary defectors are eliminated by noise. Finally, the loop is closed by noting that if no one participates in the PDG, cooperators may thrive again. However, also note that this requires the presence of at least two cooperators. This cyclic rock-scissors-paper type dominance determines the system's dynamics over a wide parameter range.

III. MEAN-FIELD AND PAIR APPROXIMATIONS

In the classical mean-field approximation, i.e. in well-mixed populations, this system is described by the (time-dependent) frequencies $f_i(t)$ of the three strategies with $f_C(t) + f_D(t) + f_L(t) = 1$ [20, 30]. Figure 1 displays the time evolution on a ternary phase diagram.

Regardless of the initial configuration, the system always approaches the homogenous L state. This result is robust against changes in the parameter values. The heteroclinic cycle along the boundary of the simplex S_3 reflects the cyclic dominance of the strategies. Mean-field approximations neglect spatial structures, i.e. they describe individuals with an infinite range of interactions or situations where co-players are randomly chosen.

In contrast, pair approximation is capable of capturing some relevant effects occurring for lasting (fixed) partnership. The frequency of strategies is determined by two-site or pair configuration probabilities (for an introduction see e.g. [34]). The probability of a strategy change depends on the configuration of an eight-site cluster consisting of the randomly chosen player, one of its randomly chosen neighbors (the pair) and their six nearest neighbors. Configuration probabilities of larger clusters are assumed to be products of the corresponding pair configuration probabilities. Due to the same connec-




FIG. 2: Different trajectories as predicted by pair approximation: (a) for $b = 1.03$ (solid line) loners go extinct and only D and C survive and co-exist in a stationary state. (b) all the three strategies coexist for $b = 1.2$ (dotted line). (c) for $b = 1.5$ the limit cycle is shown (dashed line). The bullet indicates the unstable interior fixed point. (d) the trajectory spirals towards the boundary of the simplex ($b = 1.9$).

tivity $z = 4$ of the square lattice and the chosen RRG, the two structures are indistinguishable by pair approximation.

The following systematic analysis is restricted to the case of $\beta = 0.3$ and $K = 0.1$. Figure 2 shows four typical trajectories for different values of the temptation to defect b . For very small b ($1 < b < b_0^{(p)} = 1.0485(1)$) the clustering advantage of cooperators suffices to offset exploitation by defectors. Loners are unable to provide a viable alternative and vanish. The ratio of D and C in the stationary state depends on the parameters b , β , and K . When increasing b ($b_0^{(p)} < b < b_1^{(p)} = 1.4670(3)$), a stable interior fixed point appears, i.e. all trajectories approach this stationary value where all three strategies co-exist. For $b > b_1^{(p)}$ periodic oscillations appear. Both, the amplitude and the period increase with b . In finite populations with $b > b_2^{(p)} \approx 1.85$ any strategy may go extinct due to noise and the trajectory ends in one of the absorbing homogenous states. Note that in this case the rigorous numerical analysis becomes difficult because of the extremely low configuration probabilities occurring during the oscillations.

IV. MONTE CARLO SIMULATIONS

MC simulations are performed on square lattices and on RRGs. In both cases the runs are started from random initial states. Frequencies and payoffs of all three strategies are traced over time. After an appropriate relaxation time the average frequencies and payoffs are determined (sampling times varied from 10^4 to 10^5 MC steps per site).




FIG. 3: Average frequency of defectors (squares), cooperators (diamonds), and loners (triangles) as a function of b for $K = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.3$ on square lattices. The solid (dashed) lines show the stable (unstable) stationary values predicted by pair approximation.

The linear extension of the square lattice with periodic boundary conditions was 400 sites for most MC simulations. However, in the vicinity of transition points the system size was increased to up to 800 sites in order to suppress undesired diverging fluctuations.

The simulations confirm that loners die out for small $b < b_0^{(sq)} = 1.0262(1)$. In fact, since loners invade the territory of defectors, they can only survive if the frequency of defectors exceeds a threshold value. Note that in the vicinity of the transition point, the pair approximation predicts slightly lower defector frequencies and therefore a higher threshold value.

The frequency of loners vanishes continuously when decreasing $b \rightarrow b_0^{(sq)}$. The numerical analysis of MC data suggests that this extinction process belongs to the directed percolation universality class [34, 35]. Related critical transitions were reported and discussed in [16, 17, 28]. In contrast to this non-analytical transition, the pair approximation predicts a mean-field type behavior, i.e. the frequency of loners vanishes linearly with $b - b_0^{(p)}$.

For $b > b_0^{(sq)}$ the frequency of loners (defectors) increases (decreases) monotonously with b . However note that the oscillatory behavior predicted by pair approximation is absent on square lattices. The time evolution of the lattice shows cyclic invasions for any site but the phases of these local oscillations are not synchronized [31]. Instead, the cyclic invasion sustains a self-organizing poly-domain structure. Similar patterns are observed for spatial rock-scissors-paper games (see e.g. [24, 25, 27]).

To illustrate the striking difference between the results obtained on square lattices and RRG, we compare two trajectories determined by MC simulations for the same model parameters (see Fig. 4). On square lattices the trajectory evolves towards a stable interior fixed point. In contrast, on RRG the trajectory approaches a periodic limit cycle. Note that for such




FIG. 4: Time evolution of strategy frequencies according to MC simulations for $b = 1.5$, $\gamma = 0.3$, and $K = 0.1$. The solid line shows the trajectory on a square lattice with 600×600 sites. The dashed line indicates the limit cycle on a RRG with $N = 5 \times 10^5$ sites.




FIG. 5: Average frequency of defectors versus temptation b obtained by MC simulations (closed squares) on RRG and by pair approximation (solid line). The minimum and maximum frequency of D is indicated by open symbols (simulations) and dashed lines (pair approximation).

large system sizes, the noise amplitude is comparable to the line width. The oscillatory behavior is very similar to the predictions by pair approximation (see Fig. 2). Moreover, the amplitude again increases with b . To demonstrate this nice agreement, the average, minimal and maximal frequencies of defectors are depicted in Fig. 5. The MC data is obtained by averaging over 10^4 MC steps per sites after suitable relaxation times for $N = 10^6$ sites. In absence of periodic oscillations, the difference between the minimum and maximum values increases very slowly with b until for $b = b_1^{\text{rrg}} = 1.485(1)$




FIG. 6: Average frequencies of defectors (squares), cooperators (diamonds), and loners (triangles) as a function of b for $\gamma = 0.3$ and $K = 0.1$ on RRG. The solid and dashed lines show the stable and unstable predictions of pair approximation.

a Hopf-bifurcation occurs. For $b > b_1$ the extremal values quickly separate from the average value reflecting the oscillating behavior in close agreement with pair approximation.

Simulations for $b > b_2^{(\text{rrg})} \approx 1.82$ confirm another prediction of pair approximation: in finite populations, oscillations with increasing amplitudes are eventually stopped by the extinction of either one of the strategies and the system ends up in the respective homogenous absorbing state. This means if cooperators are to die out first, the system evolves into a state with all loners. Obviously any strategy may disappear first but the probabilities depend on the parameters, the initial configuration and the system size. For example, about 87% (13%) of randomly initialized runs lead to a homogeneous loner (defector) state for $b = 1.8$ and $N = 10^6$.

On RRG the results of MC simulations are well described by pair approximation as illustrated in Fig. 6. For such structures, the extinction of loners is expected to be a mean-field type process [33]. Rigorous analysis of our MC data confirms that loners indeed vanish linearly with $b - b_0^{(\text{rrg})}$ where $b_0^{(\text{rrg})} = 1.43858(3)$.

In the region of coexistence ($b_0^{(\text{rrg})} < b < b_2^{(\text{rrg})}$) the frequency of loners (defectors) increases (decreases) monotonously with b . But note that the cooperator frequency in MC simulations slightly increases in the oscillating region ($b_1^{(\text{rrg})} < b < b_2^{(\text{rrg})}$). The dashed lines in Fig. 6 represent the unstable stationary solution of pair approximation meanwhile the symbols are determined by averaging over more than 300 cycles in the MC simulations.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The present investigations confirm that voluntary participation in PDG interactions is capable of preventing "the tragedy




FIG. 7: Average payoff of cooperators (diamonds) and defectors (squares) as well as the average population payoff (circles) a function of b for $K = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.3$. The dashed line indicates the loners (fixed) income and the dotted line shows the maximal payoff available for uniform cooperation. Closed (open) symbols refer to MC simulations on RRG (square lattice).

of the commons” and efficiently avoids states of mutual defection. Introducing the loner strategy gives rise to a cyclic dominance that can maintain the co-existence of all three strategies. With players arranged on a square lattice, the cyclic invasions maintain a self-organizing three-color pattern. In contrast, different types of oscillations in the frequencies of the strategies are observed if players are located on a RRG. Both scenarios have the same connectivity $z = 4$, i.e. the players invariably interact with four neighbors. Occasionally players reassess their strategy by sampling their neighborhood and switch strategy with a probability depending on the payoff difference.

From the view point of sociology (or behavioral sciences) the most relevant questions refer to the average individual income of defectors, cooperators, and loners. Figure 7 clearly illustrates that spatial extension promotes cooperation. The average payoff of cooperators is significantly higher than that of defectors but more importantly, the average population payoff is larger than the loners income. This means that the possibility to participate in the PDG has a positive net return for the population. At the same time it remains far below the maximum $m_c = 4$ leaving room for further strategical improvements.

Comparing the results for square lattices and RRG, we note that the average payoff of cooperators, and even more pronounced the average population payoff, turns out to be significantly lower on RRG. Due to the randomly drawn links between the players, cluster formation becomes more difficult while facilitating exploitation. But recall that in absence of spatial structures, only loners survive and forego the chances of the PDG. Similarly, for a sufficiently high temptation to defect ($b > b_2$) the oscillations on RRG usually terminate in the absorbing state of all loners (see above).

In this work we investigate effects of the underlying geometry on the success of cooperative strategies by comparing the game dynamics on square lattices and RRG with equal connectivity. These two structures are indistinguishable at the level of pair approximation. However, MC simulations reveal significant qualitative differences arising from the distinct topologies. At the same time, pair approximation turned out to reproduce a detailed picture of the MC results obtained on RRG.

Acknowledgments

G. S. acknowledges support of the Hungarian National Research Fund under Grant No. T-33098. Ch. H. acknowledges support of the Swiss National Science Foundation.

-
- [1] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
 - [2] J. Maynard Smith, *Evolution and the theory of games* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
 - [3] J. W. Weibull, *Evolutionary Game Theory* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1995).
 - [4] R. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation* (Basic Books, New York, 1984).
 - [5] W. D. Hamilton, *Am. Nat.* **97**, 354 (1963).
 - [6] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1944).
 - [7] R. L. Trivers, *Q. Rev. Biol.* **46**, 35 (1971).
 - [8] M. A. Nowak and K. Sigmund, *Nature* **393**, 573 (1998).
 - [9] R. Axelrod and W. D. Hamilton, *Science* **211**, 1390 (1981).
 - [10] C. Hauert, S. De Monte, J. Hofbauer, and K. Sigmund, *Science* **296**, 1129 (2002).
 - [11] M. A. Nowak and R. M. May, *Nature* **359**, 826 (1992).
 - [12] K. Sigmund, C. Hauert, and M. A. Nowak, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **98**, 10757 (2001).
 - [13] M. A. Nowak and K. Sigmund, *Nature* **364**, 56 (1993).
 - [14] B. A. Hubermann and N. S. Glance, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **90**, 7712 (1993).
 - [15] M. A. Nowak, S. Bonhoeffer, and R. M. May, *Int. J. Bifurcation and Chaos* **4**, 33 (1994).
 - [16] G. Szabó and C. Tóke, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 69 (1998).
 - [17] J. R. N. Chiappin and M. J. de Oliveira, *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 6419 (1999).
 - [18] M. H. Vainstein and J. J. Arenzon, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 051905 (2001).
 - [19] M. G. Zimmermann, V. M. Eguíluz, and M. San Miguel, in *Proceedings of Workshop on Economics and Heterogenous Interacting Agents*, edited by J. B. Zimmermann and A. Kirman (Springer Verlag, 2001).
 - [20] G. Szabó, T. Antal, P. Szabó, and M. Droz, in *Modeling Com-*

- plex Systems, AIP Conference Proceedings, Vol. 574*, edited by L. Garrido and J. Marro (AIP, Melville, 2001), p. 38.
- [21] T. Killingback and M. Doebeli, *J. theor. Biol.* **191**, 335 (1998).
 - [22] K. Brauchli, T. Killingback, and M. Doebeli, *J. theor. Biol.* **200**, 405 (1999).
 - [23] M. Nakamaru, H. Matsuda, and Y. Iwasa, *J. theor. Biol.* **184**, 65 (1997).
 - [24] G. Szabó, T. Antal, P. Szabó, and M. Droz, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 1095 (2000).
 - [25] K.-I. Tainaka, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 3401 (1994).
 - [26] L. Frachebourg and P. L. Krapivsky, *J. Phys. A* **31**, L287 (1998).
 - [27] M. Frean and E. R. Abraham, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **268**, 1323 (2001).
 - [28] G. Szabó and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 118101 (2002).
 - [29] G. Hardin, *Science* **162**, 1243 (1968).
 - [30] C. Hauert, S. De Monte, J. Hofbauer, and K. Sigmund, *J. theor. Biol.* (**in print**) (2002).
 - [31] C. Hauert (2002), virtual experiments with public goods games producing fascinating spatio-temporal patterns using Java applets., URL <http://www.univie.ac.at/virtuallabs/PublicGoods>.
 - [32] B. Bollobás, *Random Graphs* (Academic Press, New York, 1995).
 - [33] G. Szabó, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 7474 (2000).
 - [34] J. Marro and R. Dickman, *Nonequilibrium Phase Transitions in Lattice Models* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
 - [35] H. Hinrichsen, *Adv. Phys.* **49**, 815 (2000).