

Universal evolutionary model for periodical species

Eric Goles · Ivan Slapničar · Marco A. Lardies

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Real-world examples of periods of periodical species range from cicadas whose life-cycles are larger prime numbers, like 13 or 17, to bamboos whose periods are large multiples of small primes, like 40 or even 120. The periodicity is caused by interaction of species, be it a predator-prey relationship, symbiosis, commensalism, or competition exclusion principle. We propose a simple mathematical model which explains and models all those principles, including listed extremal cases. This, rather universal, *qualitative* model is based on the concept of a local fitness function, where a randomly chosen new period is selected if the value of the global fitness function of the species increases. Arithmetically speaking, the different interactions are related to only four principles: given a couple of integer periods either (1) their greatest common divisor is one, (2) one of the periods is prime, (3) both periods are equal, or (4) one period is an integer multiple of the other.

Keywords Periodical species · Evolutionary model · Fitness function · Cicadas · Bamboos

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 92D15 · 92D25

E. Goles
Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Universidad Adolfo Ibañez, Diagonal Las Torres 2700,
Peñalolen, Santiago, Chile E-mail: eric.goles@uai.cl

I. Slapničar
corresponding author, University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical
Engineering and Naval Architecture, R. Boškovića 32, 21000 Split, Croatia E-mail:
ivan.slapnicar@fesb.hr

M. Lardies
Facultad de Artes Liberales, Universidad Adolfo Ibañez, Santiago, Chile E-mail:
marco.lardies@uai.cl

Declarations

Funding

Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Availability of data and material

Not applicable.

Code availability

Julia program used to run simulations and produce figures is available at <https://github.com/ivanslapnicar/EvolutionaryModel.jl>.

Authors' contributions

E. G. conceived of project. I. S. computed simulations. E. G., I. S. and M. L. carried out research and wrote the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

Part of this work was done while E. G. was visiting University of Split. Part of this work was done while I. S. was visiting Universidad Adolfo Ibañez supported by the grant from Centro de modelamiento matematico, Santiago, Chile. We would like to thank James Powell, Utah State University, Logan, for commenting on the final draft of the paper.

1 Introduction

Life history diversity is a remarkable feature of living species and underlies fundamental evolutionary questions Roff (2002). Periodical species are well-known for their mass and synchronous reproduction Janzen (1976). The use of an appropriate model to evaluate synchronicity in periodical species depends first on the life-history strategies of the species. For example, some species have a life-history with discrete non-overlapping generations, that is, there are no adult survivors from one generation to the next. Such species includes

annual plants, annual insects, salmon, periodical cicadas and bamboos species Rockwood (2015). Once the adults reproduce, they perish, and the future of the population is based on the dormant or juvenile stage of the organism. In periodical species, the population emerges synchronously from the ground or benthos (cicadas, bamboos, red or brown tides of phytoplankton species) as juveniles or adults. The growth rates before emerging in periodical cycle species are obviously affected by environment being the main driver for maintaining a minimum viable population (for example, extinction probability) the interspecific interactions with predators (including parasitoids), symbiosis, interspecific competition and/or disturbances in the habitat Lloyd and Dybas (1966); May (1983); Grant (2005); Beasley et al. (2018). Furthermore, the nature of these interactions can vary depending on the evolutionary context and environmental conditions in which they occur Ricklefs (2008), nevertheless the synchrony is maintained despite abrupt changes in the environment Chen (1973); Koenig and Liebhold (2013).

Understanding that natural forces drive this extraordinary periodical cycles is a central question in ecology. To understand these evolutionary processes, a broader view is needed of the properties of multiscale spatio-temporal patterns in species–environment interactions Goodnight et al. (2008). Periodical species are plants or animals which emerge in nature every $T > 1$ years, like some few species of cicadas (every 3, 13, 17 years) or bamboos (2, 3, 5, 15, 32, 60, 120 years), and other flowering plants Kakishima et al. (2011). Density-dependent selection is the simplest form of feedback between an ecological effect of an organism’s own making (crowding due to sustained population growth) and the selective response to the resulting conditions Travis et al. (2013). Density-dependent fitness and density-dependent selection are critical concepts underlying ideas about adaptation to biotic selection pressures and the coadaptation of interacting species. To understand those periods (and other related processes) several models have been proposed Tanaka et al. (2009). In most of them one of the relevant assumptions is the “satiating hypothesis”, that is, organisms have to emerge in very large numbers in order to satiate predators (birds, rats, etc.) and consequently linked to climate conditions Kelly and Sork (2002); Kakishima et al. (2011) but also Koenig and Liebhold (2013). Those assumptions explains synchronicity but not necessarily $T > 1$ life-cycles. Since the usual life-cycle of those organisms is annual, the question is how it may evolve to a $T > 1$ period? Several evolutionary pressures have been proposed to explain periodical life-cycles. In Yoshimura (1997); Yoshimura et al. (2009) authors present a deterministic discrete populational model as a mechanism which is related with systematic low temperatures in the ice ages in Pleistocene epoch. In this case, under the cold temperature pressure, selected cicadas are those with large periods underground during the metamorphosis stage in order to avoid low temperatures (but see also Ito et al. (2015)). Other theories that promote stabilising selection provide explanations for the existence of synchronous seeding in bamboos Veller et al. (2015). From this later assumption they proposed a model such that from the usual synchronously annual emergence of seeds, a mutation with period $T > 1$ may appear. However,

some problems remain: why periodical cicadas have prime life-cycles?; why bamboos have some small prime cycles as well as very large non-primes life cycles? Some authors have proposed a very simple model for cicadas prime life-cycles by assuming the existence of a periodical predator Goles et al. (2001). In this context, it was proved that the fixed points for the non-extinct periodical cicadas are necessarily prime numbers. Nevertheless, simulations were done which exhibit convergence to prime numbers only by accepting mutations in a narrow temporal scale (for instance plus or minus one year concerning the current life-cycle). Other models take into account an hybridization hypothesis, that is, if the life-cycle of two species of prey are prime numbers, T and T' so they encounter only every multiple of $T \times T'$ years, this diminishes drastically the probability of hybridization which will produce other life-cycles with less offspring Yoshimura (1997). However, it is important to remark that in order to satisfy the hybridization hypothesis it is enough to consider only relative primes life-cycles Tanaka et al. (2009). Based on the several gaps of the models presented previously, it is required to develop a mathematical theory that includes the possible mechanism of how periodical life-cycles are shaped by diverse kinds of interspecific interactions in an evolutionay context in nature.

In this work we propose a universal qualitative framework for species with synchronic periodical cycles, which is based on local fitness functions and the evolution of species interaction evaluating the extinction probability of species. Additionally, we describe the convergence of the proposed model and completely characterize its fixed points, leading to conclusion that different interactions are related to only four principles. The paper is organised as follows: in Section 2.1 we define general model based on the notion of a fitness function. In Section 2.1 we classify all fitness functions which appear in our model and reduce them to 18 cases (fitness tuples) which need to be studied. In Section 2.3 we describe the dynamics of the model and state the evolution algorithm. In Section 2.4 characterize all fixed points of the studied fitness functions in the case of bounded mutations In Section3 we present numerical simulations for two cases of bounded mutations as well as more general “quantitative” fitness functions. In Section 4 we discuss our results and some open questions, including small modifications which exhibit fixed points which are very large periods. In Section 5 we draw our conclusions.

2 Model

2.1 General model

Consider two species, \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , with a emergence period $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_1, c_2 \geq 2$ (in years). Consider the interval $T = c_1 \cdot c_2$, and the emergence functions

$$\chi_i : [1, T] \rightarrow \{0, 1\},$$

such that $\chi_i(t) = 1$ if and only if the species \mathcal{C}_i emerges in year t . Clearly, species \mathcal{C}_1 emerges exactly c_2 times in the interval $[1, T]$ and, respectively, \mathcal{C}_2 emerges exactly c_1 times.

Let us now define the (local) fitness functions associated to \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 as:

$$f_i : \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

such that $f_1(0, *) = f_2(*, 0) = 0$, that is, if species is dormant, the value of its fitness function is zero. If the species is emergent, the value of its fitness function with respect to the other species may be 1, 0 or -1 (good, neutral or bad). This simple model is qualitative, but it captures all interesting types of behaviour.

For given periods c_1 and c_2 , the global (cumulative) fitness function over the interval $[1, T]$ is obtained by simply adding yearly values of local fitness function and dividing them by the number of years in which the species appears in this interval:

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2} \sum_{t=1}^T f_1(\chi_1(t), \chi_2(t)),$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_2(\chi_1(t), \chi_2(t)).$$

2.2 Classes of fitness functions

Given two species, \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , and their local fitness functions, f_1 and f_2 , respectively, the only interesting situations are when the species are emergent. Therefore, the only cases which need to be considered are given by the 4-tuple

$$v \equiv (\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4) = (f_1(1, 0), f_2(0, 1), f_1(1, 1), f_2(1, 1)) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^4.$$

We shall call such 4-tuple *fitness tuple* or just *tuple*. Consequently, we have a total of $3^4 = 81$ possibly different tuples v . We reduce this number in three steps to only 18 tuples that need to be studied as follows. First, we eliminate equivalent tuples¹. After eliminating equivalent tuples, we are left with v to 45 tuples, which we divide into four classes²:

$$A = \{(a, a, b, b) \mid a, b \in \{-1, 0, 1\}\}$$

$$= \{(-1, -1, -1, -1), (-1, -1, 0, 0), (-1, -1, 1, 1), (0, 0, -1, -1),$$

$$(0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1), (1, 1, -1, -1), (1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1, 1)\},$$

$$B = \{(a, a, -1, 0), (a, a, -1, 1), (a, a, 0, 1) \mid a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}\}$$

$$= \{(-1, -1, -1, 0), (-1, -1, -1, 1), (-1, -1, 0, 1), (0, 0, -1, 0),$$

¹ Two tuples are equivalent if they are obtained by simply exchanging species \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , that is $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4) \equiv (\nu_2, \nu_1, \nu_4, \nu_3)$.

² For the class D we also take into account the symmetry when one exchanges species, that is, $(a, b, c, d) = (b, a, d, c)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (0, 0, -1, 1), (0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 1, -1, 0), (1, 1, -1, 1), (1, 1, 0, 1)\}, \\
C = & \{(-1, 0, a, a), (-1, 1, a, a), (0, 1, a, a) \mid a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}\} \\
= & \{(-1, 0, -1, -1), (-1, 1, -1, -1), (0, 1, -1, -1), (-1, 0, 0, 0), \\
& (-1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (-1, 0, 1, 1), (-1, 1, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1)\}, \\
D = & \{(a, b, c, d) \mid (a \neq b) \wedge (c \neq d)\} \\
& \{(-1, 0, -1, 0), (-1, 0, 0, -1), (-1, 0, -1, 1), (-1, 0, 1, -1), (-1, 0, 0, 1), \\
& (-1, 0, 1, 0), (-1, 1, -1, 0), (-1, 1, 0, -1), (-1, 1, -1, 1), (-1, 1, 1, -1), \\
& (-1, 1, 0, 1), (-1, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, -1, 0), (0, 1, 0, -1), (0, 1, -1, 1), \\
& (0, 1, 1, -1), (0, 1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1, 0)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second step, we eliminate tuples without biological interest or meaning:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1, -1, -1, -1), (-1, -1, 0, 0), (0, 0, -1, -1), (0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0), \\
& (1, 1, 1, 1), (-1, -1, -1, 0), (-1, -1, -1, 1), (-1, -1, 0, 1), (0, 0, -1, 0), \\
& (0, 0, 0, 1), (-1, 0, -1, -1), (-1, 1, -1, -1), (-1, 0, 0, 0), (-1, 1, 0, 0), \\
& (0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1), (-1, 0, -1, 0), (-1, 0, -1, 1), (-1, 1, -1, 0), \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad (-1, 1, -1, 1), (0, 1, 0, 1).
\end{aligned}$$

For example, for the tuple $(-1, 0, -1, 0)$ the species does not have any positive evolution pressure and the other species is completely indifferent.

In the third step, we eliminate tuples for which one of the fitness functions is always negative according to the following lemma:

Lemma 1 *For the tuples*

$$\begin{aligned}
& (0, 1, -1, -1), (0, 0, -1, 1), (0, 1, -1, 1), (0, 1, -1, 0), \\
& (0, -1, -1, 0), (0, 1, -1, 0), \text{ and } (-1, 0, 1, -1)
\end{aligned}$$

one of the global fitness functions is always negative.

Proof. See Appendix A.1.

Therefore, the final set of tuples to study, \mathcal{V} , consists of the 18 tuples listed in Table 1. We call such tuples *relevant fitness tuples* and we number them for further reference.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
v_1 = (-1, 0, 1, 1) & v_2 = (-1, 1, 1, 1) & v_3 = (0, 1, 1, 1) \\
v_4 = (0, 0, 1, 1) & v_5 = (-1, -1, 1, 1) & v_6 = (1, 1, -1, -1) \\
v_7 = (1, 1, -1, 0) & v_8 = (1, 1, 1, -1) & v_9 = (-1, 1, 1, -1) \\
v_{10} = (-1, 1, 1, 0) & v_{11} = (1, 0, -1, 0) & v_{12} = (0, 1, 1, -1) \\
v_{13} = (0, 1, 1, 0) & v_{14} = (1, 1, 1, 0) & v_{15} = (0, -1, 1, 0) \\
v_{16} = (-1, 0, 1, 0) & v_{17} = (1, -1, -1, 0) & v_{18} = (1, -1, 1, 0)
\end{array}$$

Table 1 Relevant fitness tuples.

Each tuple may be represented by its respective ecological graph as in Figure 2.2. By inspecting corresponding ecological graphs, we classify tuples

from Table 1 in four classes. The first class, \mathcal{V}_1 , is the set off all tuples for which the corresponding graph is not strongly connected:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_1 &= \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid (f_1(1, 1) = 0) \vee (f_2(1, 1) = 0)\} = \\ &= \{v_7, v_{10}, v_{11}, v_{13}, v_{14}, v_{15}, v_{16}, v_{17}, v_{18}\}.\end{aligned}$$

The other three classes are:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_2 &= \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid f_1(1, 1) = f_2(1, 1) = 1\} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_3 &= \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid f_1(1, 1) = f_2(1, 1) = -1\} = \{v_6\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_4 &= \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid f_1(1, 1) \cdot f_2(1, 1) = -1\} = \{v_8, v_9, v_{12}\}.\end{aligned}$$




Fig. 1 Generic ecological graph.

2.3 Dynamics of the model

We describe the evolution of species \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 . Given initial periods $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_1, c_2 \geq 2$, the first iteration of the evolution game is as follows: for the species \mathcal{C}_1 we propose random local change of its period c_1 to new period $c'_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c'_1 \geq 2$. If the value of the global fitness function of the species \mathcal{C}_1 has improved, that is, if $F_1(c'_1, c_2) > F_1(c_1, c_2)$, the period c'_1 is accepted as the new period, $c_1 \leftarrow c'_1$, and the value of the global fitness function of the other species, \mathcal{C}_2 , is recomputed. The analogous procedure is now applied to the species \mathcal{C}_2 . Such iterations are repeated until there is no change. The pseudocode of the algorithm is given in Algorithm 1.

We will also assume that the evolutionary game changes each species in a mutation interval $[-p, p] = [-p, -p + 1, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, p]$, that is, the arbitrarily far moves do not exist in the algorithm. More precisely, the new periods c'_1 and c'_2 are chosen as

$$c'_1 = c_1 + k, \quad c'_2 = c_2 + l, \quad k, l \in [-p, p].$$

We say that a couple of periods (c_1, c_2) for the given tuple v is a *p-fixed point* if and only if $\forall k, l \in [-p, p]$

$$F_1(c_1 + k, c_2) \leq F_1(c_1, c_2)$$

Algorithm 1 Evolution dynamics

```

procedure EVOLUTION( $c_1, c_2, v$ )                                ▷  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}, c_1, c_2 \geq 2$ 
   $T = c_1 \cdot c_2$ 
  compute  $F_1(c_1, c_2)$  and  $F_2(c_1, c_2)$ 
  loop
    choose  $c'_1$  at random                                       ▷  $c'_1 \geq 2$ 
     $T' = c'_1 \cdot c_2$ 
    compute  $F'_1(c'_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2} \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_1(\chi_1(t), \chi_2(t))$ 
    if  $F'_1(c'_1, c_2) > F_1(c_1, c_2)$  then                       ▷ the fitness of  $\mathcal{C}_1$  improved
       $c_1 \leftarrow c'_1$                                          ▷ accept the new period
      recompute  $F_2(c_1, c_2)$ 
    end if
    choose  $c'_2$  at random                                       ▷  $c'_2 \geq 2$ 
     $T' = c_1 \cdot c'_2$ 
    compute  $F'_2(c_1, c'_2) = \frac{1}{c_1} \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_2(\chi_1(t), \chi_2(t))$ 
    if  $F'_2(c_1, c'_2) > F_2(c_1, c_2)$  then                       ▷ the fitness of  $\mathcal{C}_2$  improved
       $c_2 \leftarrow c'_2$                                          ▷ accept the new period
      recompute  $F_1(c_1, c_2)$ 
    end if
  end loop
end procedure

```

and

$$F_2(c_1, c_2 + l) \leq F_2(c_1, c_2).$$

In this context, fixed points are related to the interval of possible time jumps. We also speak of *global fixed point* when the above is true for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.4 Characterization of fixed points

For the next results we will consider the evolution algorithm for $p = 1$, that is, in $[-1, 1]$ mutation space. In particular, by “local fixed point” we mean 1-fixed point. The results for p -fixed points are similar (see Numerical simulations and Discussion).

The first results are related with the relations between the sets of fixed points in any of the classes \mathcal{V}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. For that, let us define the set of fixed points as:

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{(c_1, c_2) \mid c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and it is an fixed point for the tuple } v_k\}.$$

The relations between the sets are as follows:

Lemma 2 *For the tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_1 we have:*

$$\mathcal{A}_7 \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{11}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{10} = \mathcal{A}_{13} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{14}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{15} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{16},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{10} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{16}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{17} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{11}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{17} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{18}.$$

For the tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_2 we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_4 = \mathcal{A}_5 \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_3.$$

For the tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_4 we have

$$\mathcal{A}_9 = \mathcal{A}_{12} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_8.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.2.

Using Lemma 2, we eliminate tuples v_3, v_4, v_5, v_{12} and v_{13} from Table 1. We shall call the remaining tuples inside each class *representative tuples*. Now we characterize the fixed points inside each class.

Proposition 1 *For the representative tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_1 the structure of fixed points is as follows:*

- For v_7 there exist global fixed points such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, and there exist infinitely many local ones.
- For v_{10} there exist infinitely many local fixed points, but no global ones.
- For v_{11} there exist global fixed points such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, as well as infinitely many local ones.
- For v_{14} there exist global fixed points such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, as well as infinitely many local ones.
- For v_{15} , the couples (c_1, c_2) such that $c_1 = c_2$ are global fixed points. Further, there exist infinitely many local ones.
- For v_{16} , the couples (c_1, c_2) such that $c_2 \mid c_1$ are global fixed points, and there exist infinitely many local ones.
- For v_{17} there are no global fixed points, but there are infinitely many local ones. For instance, couples (c_1, c_2) such that c_1 is a prime number and $c_2 < c_1 - 1$ are local fixed points.
- For v_{18} , the couples (c_1, c_2) such that $c_1 \mid c_2$ are global fixed points, and there exist infinitely many local ones.

Proof. See Appendix A.3.

Proposition 2 *For the representative tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_2 we have:*

- v_1 admits the global fixed points (c_1, c_2) such that $c_1 = c_2$. Further, there exist also infinitely many local fixed points.
- For v_2 , any couple (c_1, c_2) such that $c_2 \mid c_1$ is a global fixed point. Further, there exist infinitely many local fixed points.

Proof. See Appendix A.4.

Proposition 3 *For the class $\mathcal{V}_3 = \{v_6\}$, every (c_1, c_2) such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, is a global fixed point. There exist infinitely many local fixed points.*

Proof. See Appendix A.5.

Proposition 4 *For the representative tuples in the class \mathcal{V}_4 we have:*

- v_8 admits global fixed points (c_1, c_2) such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$. Further, it admits infinitely many local fixed points.
- v_9 only admits local fixed points: if (c_1, c_2) is such that c_2 is prime and $c_2 \notin \{c_1 - 1, c_1 + 1\}$, then it is a local fixed point. Further, the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears. Also, there exist other infinite families of local fixed points.

Proof. See Appendix A.6.

3 Numerical simulations

We ran simulations to illustrate the behavior of the representative 4-tuples. A couple of periods (c_1, c_2) is a p -fixed point under simulation if, after thirty steps, neither of the species changes its period. We plot fixed points using the following convention: If (c_1, c_2) is *not* an fixed point, the corresponding square on the plot is white, otherwise it is red if both species survive, or gray if the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears. The link to the complete code used to run simulations is given in Declarations.

The plots in Figures 2-7 depict characteristic behaviour of the qualitative model described in Propositions 1-4 (see also Discussion). For easier visual reference when interpreting the figures, Figure 8 shows canonical plots of three typical situations.

The first plot in each row shows the results of the simulation for the corresponding fitness tuple for the mutation interval $[-p, p] = [-1, 1]$. The second plot in each row shows the results for the mutation interval $[-p, p] = [-4, 4]$ – as expected, by increasing mutation interval some local fixed points cease to be fixed points, but global fitness points remain.

We also simulated what happens in more “qualitative” setting, that is, when local fitness functions are generalized such that

$$f_i : \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In order to run these tests, each entry of fitness tuple was multiplied by a random integer from the interval $[1, 10]$ and the mutation interval was $[-p, p] = [-1, 1]$. The results are displayed in the third plot in each row. It is worth noting that the plots are indeed similar to the plots in the first two columns. These simulations indicates that our qualitative model covers well different qualitative cases, but this should by no means be considered a proof of such claim, without further analysis. Clearly, analysis for any particular fitness tuple could be done, if the specific case of interest appears.




Fig. 2 Attractors for tuples v_7 , v_{11} and v_{17} from Proposition 1. The tuples are of a “competition” type. Global fixed points for v_7 and v_{11} are those with $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$. In v_{17} , the species C_1 has a behaviour like periodic cicadas with prime number fixed points. In this case, the species C_2 disappears, since the fitness $F_2(c_1, c_2)$ is always negative. Attractors are marked with red squares if both species survive and with gray squares if one of the species disappears.




Fig. 3 Attractors for tuples v_{16} and v_{18} from Proposition 1. Here one of the global fitness functions is constant ($F_2(c_1, c_2) = 0$ for v_{16} and $F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1$ for v_{18}), while the other species has a bamboo-like behaviour – it emerges as an integer multiple of the constant one. In both cases there is a “commensalism” interaction.




Fig. 4 Attractors for tuples v_{14} and v_{15} from Proposition 1. For v_{14} , global fixed points are again those with $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, and for v_{15} , global fixed points are those with $c_1 = c_2$.




Fig. 5 Attractors for tuples v_1 and v_2 from Proposition 2. The tuple v_1 generates symbiosis of the two species, that is, they have to appear at the same time (here global attractors are again those with $c_1 = c_2$). The tuple v_2 generates a “commensalism” relation: the period c_1 has to be an integer multiple of c_2 , $c_2 \mid c_1$, independently of c_1 (a “bamboo” effect).




Fig. 6 Attractors for tuple v_6 from Proposition 3. This is the case of two species which cannot emerge together – they are mutually harmful. In this sense, the competition exclusion principle can originate local extinction in populations. Global fixed points are those with $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$. Notice that the fixed points for fitness tuples v_6, v_7, v_8, v_{11} and v_{14} are similar.




Fig. 7 Attractors for tuples v_8 and v_9 from Proposition 4. Both tuples generate predator-prey interaction, the species C_2 being the prey. For v_8 , C_1 does not depend on C_2 (it may feed on other items), but C_2 has to escape, hence global fixed points are those with $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$. For v_9 there is dependence between the prey and the predator: the species C_1 must eat C_2 in order to survive, and C_2 must escape from C_1 in order to survive. Local fixed points are those with prime c_2 and $c_2 \notin \{c_1 - 1, c_1 + 1\}$ (cicadas-like behaviour). Here also $F_1(c_1, c_2) < 0$, so the species C_1 disappears.




Fig. 8 For easier visual reference, here are canonical plots of three typical situations: gray denotes pairs (c_1, c_2) , $c_1, c_2 > 1$, such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, c_2 is prime, or $c_2 \mid c_1$, respectively.

4 Discussion

By analyzing the ecological factors that shape development, reproduction and survival, life history theory seeks to explain the evolution of the major features of life cycles Stearns (1992). The complex spatial and temporal populational dynamics of periodical species are largely consequences of evolution of species interactions. Our models are relatively simple and describe accurately the evolution of several types of periodical species with synchronized emergence including species associated with prime-numbered (i.e. insects) and non-prime numbered life-cycles (i.e. plants) Heliövaara et al. (1994); Hajong and Yaakop (2013); Guerreiro (2014). Several fitness tuples in our model show that various life cycles and their respective periodical emergences extinguish each other. On the other hand, our computer simulations demonstrate that the evolution of the periodicity is possible under restricted conditions. Here we first comment four propositions and their respective classes of fitness tuples.

In the class \mathcal{V}_1 (Proposition 1) there are two types of behaviour. The tuples v_7 , v_{11} and v_{17} are of a “competition” type. In v_{17} , the species \mathcal{C}_1 has a behaviour like periodic cicadas with prime number fixed points (and in this case the species \mathcal{C}_2 disappears, since the fitness $F_2(c_1, c_2)$ is always negative). The other type of behaviour is the one generated by the tuples v_{16} and v_{18} . Here one of the global fitness functions is constant ($F_2(c_1, c_2) = 0$ for v_{16} and $F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1$ for v_{18}), while the other species has a bamboo-like behaviour – it emerges as an integer multiple of the constant one. In both cases there is a “commensalism” interaction, a special kind of symbiosis.

The tuples v_1 and v_2 from the class \mathcal{V}_2 (Proposition 2) generate two types of behaviour. The tuple v_1 generates symbiosis of the two species, that is, they have to appear at the same time. The tuple v_2 generates a “commensalism” relation: the period c_1 has to be an integer multiple of c_2 (which is independent of c_1), so it is also a kind of a “bamboo” effect.

The tuple v_6 (Proposition 3) is interesting since it is the case of two species which cannot emerge together – they are mutually harmful. In this sense, it is widely known that the competition exclusion principle can originate local extinction in populations Bengtsson (1989) and could be represented by this proposition. According to the host-predator hypothesis, the parasitoids, predators and certain microorganisms specializing on immature stages of a species lack prey or a substrate in the year when only adults are present. The following year the predators are at low levels when the immature host numbers are again high. The same would hold for specialist predators of adult stage. Several mathematical models have been explored in an attempt to understand the origin of periodicity. Hoppenstadt and Keller Hoppensteadt and Keller (1976) showed that synchronized emergence of a single year class is a possible consequence of predation given a limited environmental carrying capacity and life cycle lengths above a certain threshold value. Bulmer Bulmer (1977) also demonstrated that predation alone will not cause periodical behavior except as the accidental result of particular initial conditions. In this sense, our model is concordant with the last reported case.

The tuples v_8 and v_9 from the class \mathcal{V}_4 (Proposition 4) both generate predator-prey interaction, the species \mathcal{C}_2 being the prey. For v_8 , \mathcal{C}_1 does not depend on \mathcal{C}_2 (it may feed on other items), but \mathcal{C}_2 has to escape, hence $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$. For v_9 there appears real dependence between the prey and the predator: the species \mathcal{C}_1 must eat \mathcal{C}_2 in order to survive, and \mathcal{C}_2 must escape from \mathcal{C}_1 in order to survive. In this case, classes of fixed points are those with prime c_2 in which case $F_1(c_1, c_2) < 0$ so the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears. This was the case studied widely in Goles et al. (2000, 2001).

Some open questions and generalizations are related to considering full fitness tuples

$$v = (f_1(1, 0), f_2(0, 1), f_1(1, 1), f_2(1, 1), f_1(0, 1), f_2(1, 0), f_1(0, 0), f_2(0, 0)),$$

and allowing values outside of the set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. For example, large dormant intervals of bamboos could be explained by the need to minimize energy (see Gadgil and Bossert (1970)), so in this case the “dormant” values $f_1(0, 1)$ or $f_2(1, 0)$ might be positive. In particular, our simulation for the fitness tuple $v = (-1, 1, 0.8, 1, 1.25, 0, 0, 0)$ generates fixed points with periods 26, 32, 34, 38, 39 and 40 for the species \mathcal{C}_1 (see Figure 9), which were observed in the population of long-period masting bamboos, see (Janzen 1976, Table 1) and (Veller et al. 2015, Appendix, Table S1). Also, bamboos periodical life-cycles can be dramatically affected during the flowering event by anthropogenic habitat modification that cause delayed reproduction, see Wang et al. (2016). That is, the combination of a fixed juvenile development time and a long adult life could favor the development of periodical behavior but does not guarantee it, see Lauzon and Harper (1986). Again, this “qualitative” simulation is by no means proof or explanation of long period masting, it is an example of the universality of our theoretical model.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, the presented theoretical model covers all types of periodic behaviour. We learned that, from a simple arithmetic point of view, the different interactions are related to only four principles. Given a couple of integer periods (c_1, c_2) the principles are:

- $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$ (predation or interspecific competition interaction as for tuples v_6, v_7, v_8, v_{11} and v_{14}),
- one of c_1 or c_2 has to be a prime (cicadas-like behaviour as for v_9, v_{10} and v_{17}),
- $c_1 = c_2$ (symbiosis interaction as for v_1 and v_{15}), and
- one of c_1 or c_2 has to be an integer multiple of the other (bamboos-like interaction as for v_2, v_{16} and v_{18}).

Some of these principles are indeed observed in nature - periodic cycadas and long-period masting bamboos.




Fig. 9 Simulation using full fitness tuple with values outside of the set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$, generates periods longer than 12 for both species, and the species C_1 has periods 32, 34, 38, 39 and 40, as observed in the population of long-period masting bamboos.

To be periodical, a species must have a fixed life cycle length and adults must appear synchronously, reproduce only once, and die Heliövaara et al. (1994). We demonstrate that the emergence of synchrony in some species can occur by chance events which disrupt this bet-hedging strategy and set the stage for periodicity. Our mathematical model predicts that, given certain initial conditions, intraspecific competition and predation favor its development. These synchronous species should be favored by natural selection later to establish the life-cycles according the interspecific interactions or environment restrictions. Finally, it is established that the variable intensity of interspecific competition, predation and/or parasitism are interactions, which allow the existence of local stable positive periodical solutions for species such as insects and plants. However, as in any biological system, it is unlikely that one factor operates free from the influence of others.

A Proofs

For the proofs, we need some notations and definitions. We define the following quantities regarding the number of emergences in the interval $[1, T]$:

- (C_1) = the number of times species C_1 emerges,
- (C_2) = the number of times species C_2 emerges,
- $(C_1 \wedge C_2)$ = the number of times C_1 and C_2 emerge
in the same year,
- $(C_1 \wedge \overline{C_2})$ = the number of times C_1 emerges and

\mathcal{C}_2 does not emerge,
 $(\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)$ = the number of times \mathcal{C}_1 does not emerge
 and \mathcal{C}_2 emerges.

From $T = c_1 \cdot c_2$ some elementary equalities follow:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}_1) &= c_2, \\ (\mathcal{C}_2) &= c_1, \\ (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) + (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) &= c_2, \\ (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) + (\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) &= c_1. \end{aligned}$$

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

For the first six tuples we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2} (-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)) \leq \frac{-1}{c_2} < 0.$$

For the the last tuple we have

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1} (-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)) \leq \frac{-1}{c_1} < 0.$$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We will only give the proof for fixed points in the class \mathcal{V}_4 , the other proofs are similar. For the tuple $v_8 = (1, 1, -1, 1)$ we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1} ((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)).$$

For the tuple $v_9 = (-1, 1, 1, -1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2} (-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) + (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)), \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1} ((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

For the tuple $v_{12} = (0, 1, 1, -1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2} (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2), \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1} ((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{A}_8 &\Leftrightarrow F_2(c_1, c'_2) \geq F_2(c_1, c_2), \\ (c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{A}_9 &\Leftrightarrow F_1(c'_1, c_2) \geq F_1(c_1, c_2) \wedge F_2(c_1, c'_2) \geq F_2(c_1, c_2), \\ (c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{12} &\Leftrightarrow F_1(c'_1, c_2) \geq F_1(c_1, c_2) \wedge F_2(c_1, c'_2) \geq F_2(c_1, c_2). \end{aligned}$$

From that it is direct $\mathcal{A}_9 = \mathcal{A}_{12} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_8$. The strictness of the inclusion follows since, for instance, $(c_1, c_2) = (3, 14) \in \mathcal{A}_8$, but $(c_1, c_2) = (3, 14) \notin \mathcal{A}_9$ because $F_1(3 + 1, 14) < F_1(3, 14)$.

A.3 Proof of Proposition 1

For $v_7 = (1, 1, -1, 0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2}((\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)) = \frac{1}{c_2}(c_2 - 2(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)), \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1}(\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}(c_1 - 2(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, if $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, then

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{c_2 - 2}{c_2}, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{c_1 - 1}{c_1},$$

and nobody may improve.

Consider the family

$$(c_1, c_2) = (20, 16^n \cdot 4 \cdot 29 \cdot 31) = (30, 16^n \cdot 3596).$$

Clearly, $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 2$, $\gcd(c_1 - 1, c_2) = 29$, and $\gcd(c_1 + 1, c_2) = 31$ so $F_1(c_1 \pm 1, c_2) < F_1(c_1, c_2)$, so the species \mathcal{C}_1 cannot improve its fitness. Let us prove that the species \mathcal{C}_2 cannot change its period, as well. For that we will prove that $\forall n \geq 0$, $5 \mid 16^n \cdot 3596 - 1$ and $3 \mid 16^n \cdot 3596 + 1$: for $n = 0$ clearly $3596 - 1 = 3593$ is divisible by 5, and $3596 + 1 = 3597 = 3 \cdot 1199$. The induction step for $c_2 - 1$ is as follows:

$$16^{n+1} \cdot 3596 - 1 = 16^n \cdot 3596 \times 16 - 1 = 16^n \cdot 3596 \times 15 + (16^n \cdot 3596 - 1).$$

The first term on the right hand side is divisible by 5, and the second term is divisible by 5 by the induction hypothesis. Similarly, for $c_2 + 1$, we have

$$16^{n+1} \cdot 3596 + 1 = 16^n \cdot 3596 \times 16 + 1 = 16^n \cdot 3596 \times 15 + (16^n \cdot 3596 + 1).$$

The first term on the right hand side is divisible by 3, and the second term is divisible by 3 by the induction hypothesis. Therefore, $\gcd(c_1, c_2 + 1) = 5 > \gcd(c_1, c_2)$ and $\gcd(c_1, c_2 - 1) = 3 > \gcd(c_1, c_2)$, so $F_2(c_1, c_2 \pm 1) < F_2(c_1, c_2)$, hence all members of the family are local fixed points.

Consider now $v_{10} = (-1, 1, 1, 0)$. Consider, for example,

$$(c_1, c_2) = (30, 30k + 4), \quad k \geq 0.$$

Then $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 2$ so

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2}(-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) + (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)) = \frac{-c_2 + 4}{c_2}, \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1}(\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = \frac{c_1 - 2}{c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_1 + 1 = 31$ and $c_1 - 1 = 29$, $\gcd(c_1 \pm 1, c_2) = 1$, so the fitness of \mathcal{C}_1 cannot be improved. On the other hand, $c_2 + 1 = 30k + 5$, so $\gcd(c_1, c_2 + 1) \geq 5$ and $F_2(c_1, c_2 + 1) < F_2(c_1, c_2)$. Similarly, $c_2 - 1 = 30k + 3$, so $\gcd(c_1, c_2 - 1) \geq 3$ and $F_2(c_1, c_2 - 1) < F_2(c_1, c_2)$. Therefore, fitness of \mathcal{C}_2 cannot be improved, as well, so $(c_1, c_2) = (30, 30k + 4)$ is an fixed point for all $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, notice that if $c_2 > 4$, it is always $F_1(c_1, c_2) < 0$, so the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears. Also, if (c_1, c_2) is such that $c_1 \notin \{c_2 - 1, c_2 + 1\}$ and c_2 is a prime number, then (c_1, c_2) is an fixed point and \mathcal{C}_1 also disappears.

Consider now $v_{11} = (1, 0, -1, 0)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2}((\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)), \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, then $F_1 = \frac{c_2 - 2}{c_2}$ is the maximum, and they are global fixed points. Further, couples $(c_1, c_2) = (30, 30k + 4)$, $k \geq 0$, are also local fixed points: because $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 2$, we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}(2 - (c_2 - 2)) = \frac{-c_2 + 4}{c_2}, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = 0.$$

For $v_{14} = (1, 1, 1, 0)$ we have:

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}(\overline{C_1} \wedge C_2).$$

Clearly, all couples (c_1, c_2) such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$ are global fixed points, and, like in the previous case for v_{10} , the members of the family $(c_1, c_2) = (30, 30k + 4)$, $k \geq 0$, are local fixed points.

For $v_{17} = (1, -1, -1, 0)$, we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}((C_1 \wedge \overline{C_2}) - (C_1 \wedge C_2)),$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}(-\overline{C_1} \wedge C_2).$$

Clearly, global fixed points do not exist: if $F_1(c_1, c_2)$ is at its maximum, that is, $(C_1 \wedge \overline{C_2})$ (for instance, if $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$), then C_2 may reply by taking $c'_2 = c_1$. Also, if $F_2(c_1, c_2)$ is at its maximum, that is $(\overline{C_1} \wedge C_2) = 0$ (so $(C_1 \wedge C_2) = c_1$), then C_1 may reply by taking $c'_1 = c_2 \pm 1$: in that case $c'_1, c_2 = 1$ so $F_1(c'_1, c_2)$ is better.

An infinite family of local fixed points is given by couples (c_1, c_2) such that $c_2 < c_1 - 1$ and $c_1 = p$ is prime: then,

$$F_1(p, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}((c_2 - 1) - 1) = \frac{c_2 - 2}{c_2},$$

which is at its maximum, and $F_2(p, c_2 \pm 1) = F_2(p, c_2)$ because p is prime so it is not divisible by any $c_2 < p$.

The proofs for v_{15} , v_{16} and v_{18} are analogous.

A.4 Proof of Proposition 2

For $v_1 = (-1, 0, 1, 1)$ we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}(-(C_1 \wedge \overline{C_2}) + (C_1 \wedge C_2)),$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}(C_1 \wedge C_2).$$

If $c_1 = c_2$, then $(C_1 \wedge \overline{C_2}) = 0$, so $F_1(c_1, c_2) = F_2(c_1, c_2) = 1$ which is a maximum, so they are global fixed points.

Consider now the family (c_1, c_2) such that c_1 and c_2 are prime numbers and $c_1 \notin \{c_2 - 1, c_2 + 1\}$ and $c_2 \notin \{c_1 - 1, c_1 + 1\}$ (i.e., they are far enough). Then,

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}(-(c_2 - 1) + 1) = \frac{-c_2 + 2}{c_2}, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}.$$

Since c_1 and c_2 are primes, $c_1 \pm 1$ and $c_2 \pm 1$ are not divisors of c_2 or c_1 , respectively, so fitness functions cannot improve.

But, we have other families, too, which are not necessary primes, for instance: $(c_1, c_2) = (25, c_2)$, where

$$c_2 \in \{7 + 10r \mid (r \geq 0) \wedge (3 \nmid 7 + 10r)\} = \{7 + 10r \mid r \geq 0\} \setminus \{27 + 30s \mid s \geq 0\}.$$

The second set is the set of numbers divisible by 3 and is contained in the first set since $27 + 30s = 7 + 10(3s + 2)$. The difference set is infinite and, by Dirichlet's Theorem, since $\gcd(7, 10) = 1$, it contains infinitely many prime numbers.

For $v_2 = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$, we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}(-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) + (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)),$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}c_1 = 1.$$

If $c_2 \mid c_1$, then $(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) = 0$ so $F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1$ which is the maximum so it is a global fixed point.

For $(c_1, c_2) = (2^p, 2^q)$, $p < q$, it holds $\gcd(c_1 \pm 1, c_2) = \gcd(2^p \pm 1, 2^q) = 1$, so

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{2^q}(-(2^q - 2^p) + 2^p) = \frac{1}{2^q}(2^{p+1} - 2^q),$$

so it does not improve.

A.5 Proof of Proposition 3

For $v_6 = (1, 1, -1, -1)$, we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}((\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)),$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)).$$

If $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, then

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{c_2 - 2}{c_2}, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{c_1 - 2}{c_1},$$

which is a global fixed point.

The members of the family $(c_1, c_2) = (30, 16^n \cdot 3596)$, are also local fixed points - the proof is as for v_7 in Appendix A.3.

A.6 Proof of Proposition 4

For the tuple $v_8 = (1, 1, 1, -1)$ we have

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = 1,$$

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)).$$

Then (c_1, c_2) such that $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$ is a global fixed point, since in this case $(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) = (\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = 1$, so

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}((c_1 - 1) - 1) = \frac{c_1 - 2}{c_1}$$

is the maximum.

There exist infinitely many local fixed points, for instance

$$(c_1, c_2) = (2 \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c, 4), \quad b, c \geq 1.$$

In this case $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 2$, so

$$F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_1}((c_1 - 2) - 2) = \frac{c_1 - 4}{c_1}.$$

But, $c_2 - 1 = 3$, $c_2 + 1 = 5$, and in both cases $\gcd(c_1, c_2 \pm 1) \geq 3$, so $F_2(c_1, c_2 \pm 1) < F_2(c_1, c_2)$. Consider now $v_9 = (-1, 1, 1, -1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2}(-(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \overline{\mathcal{C}_2}) + (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)), \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1}((\overline{\mathcal{C}_1} \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) - (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

If $\gcd(c_1, c_2) = 1$, then $(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = 1$ and

$$F_1(c_1, c_2) = \frac{-c_2 + 2}{c_2}, \quad F_2(c_1, c_2) = \frac{c_1 - 2}{c_1}.$$

If c_2 is prime and $c_1 \pm 1 \notin \{c_2 \pm 1\}$, then (c_1, c_2) is a local fixed point. If, additionally, $c_2 \geq 3$, the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears.

But, there exist infinitely many local fixed points. Let us see one case: consider $(c_1, c_2) = (2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5, 2s) = (30, 2s)$ such that $3 \mid (c_2 - 1)$ and $5 \mid (c_2 + 1)$. Clearly, we have $\gcd(30, 2s) = 2$, so

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_2}(-(c_2 - 2) + 2) = \frac{-c_2 + 4}{c_2}, \\ F_2(c_1, c_2) &= \frac{1}{c_1}((c_1 - 2) - 2) = \frac{c_1 - 4}{c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

But, since $c_1 - 1 = 29$ and $c_1 + 1 = 31$ are both prime numbers,

$$F_1(c_1 \pm 1, c_2) = \frac{1}{c_2}(-(c_2 - 1) + 1) = \frac{-c_2 + 2}{c_2} < \frac{-c_2 + 4}{c_2} = F_1(c_1, c_2),$$

so the fitness of the species \mathcal{C}_1 cannot improve.

Let us see c_2 : $2s \pm 1$ is not even and, by hypothesis, it is divisible by 3 or 5. Therefore, $\gcd(c_1, c_2 \pm 1) \geq 3$ so $F_2(c_1, c_2 \pm 1) < F_2(c_1, c_2)$, and the fitness of the species \mathcal{C}_2 cannot improve either.

It remains to prove that there are infinitely many prime numbers s such that $3 \mid (2s - 1)$ and $5 \mid (2s + 1)$. Suppose

$$c_2 - 1 = 2s - 1 = 3m, \quad c_2 + 1 = 2s + 1 = 5n, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $3m + 2 = 5n$, so

$$m = \frac{5n - 2}{3} = \frac{(3 + 2)n - 2}{3} = n + 2 \left(\frac{n - 1}{3} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

There exist integer solutions for m and n : for $n = 4 + 3k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 0$ it holds

$$m = \frac{5(4 + 3k) - 2}{3} = \frac{18 + 15k}{3} = 5k + 6.$$

Then

$$2s = 3m + 1 = 3(5k + 6) + 1 = 15k + 19, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Since $2s$ is even, k must be odd. By setting $k = 2l + 1$, $l \geq 0$, we have

$$c_2 = 2s \in \{34 + 30l \mid l \geq 0\} \equiv B.$$

Set B is an arithmetic progression such that $\gcd(17, 15) = 1$, hence by Dirichlet's Theorem it contains infinitely many primes. We conclude that there exist infinitely many couples $(30, 2s)$, s prime, which are local fixed points for the rule v_9 . Since $c_2 > 4$, we have $F_1(c_1, c_2) < 0$, so the species \mathcal{C}_1 disappears.

References

- Beasley DE, Penick CA, Boateng NS, Menninger HL, Dunn RR (2018) Urbanization disrupts latitude-size rule in 17-year cicadas. *Ecology and Evolution* 8:2534–2541
- Bengtsson J (1989) Interspecific competition increases local extinction rate in a metapopulation system. *Nature* 340:713–715
- Bulmer MG (1977) Periodical insects. *American Naturalist* 111:1099–1117
- Chen MY (1973) Giant timber bamboo in alabama. *Journal of Forestry* 71:777
- Gadgil M, Bossert WH (1970) Life historical consequences of natural selection. *American Naturalist* 104:1–24
- Goles E, Schulz O, Markus M (2000) A biological generator of prime numbers. *Nonlinear Phenomena in Complex Systems* 3:208–213
- Goles E, Schultz O, Markus M (2001) Prime number selection of cycles in a predator-prey model. *Complexity* 6(4):33–38
- Goodnight C, Rauch E, Sayama H, Aguiar MAMD, Baranger M, Bar-yam Y (2008) Evolution in spatial predator-prey models and the prudent predator: the inadequacy of steady-state organism fitness and the concept of individual and group selection. *Complexity* 13:23–44
- Grant PR (2005) The priming of periodical cicada life cycles. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 20:169–174
- Guerreiro C (2014) Flowering cycles of woody bamboos native to southern south america. *Journal of Plant Research* 127:307–313
- Hajong SR, Yaakop S (2013) *Chremistica ribhoi* sp. n. (hemiptera: Cicadidae) from north-east india and its mass emergence. *Zootaxa* 3702:493–500
- Heliövaara K, Väisänen R, Simon C (1994) Evolutionary ecology of periodical insects. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 9:475–480
- Hoppensteadt FC, Keller JB (1976) Synchronization of periodical cicada emergences. *Science* 194:335–337
- Ito H, Kakishima S, Morita TUS, Koyama T, Sota T, Cooley JR, Yoshimura J (2015) Evolution of periodicity in periodical cicadas. *Scientific Reports* 5:14094
- Janzen DH (1976) Why bamboos wait so long to flower. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 7:347–391
- Kakishima S, Yoshimura J, Murata H, Murata J (2011) 6-year periodicity and variable synchronicity in a mass-flowering plant. *PLoS ONE* 6:e28140
- Kelly D, Sork VL (2002) Mast seeding in perennial plants: why how, where? *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 33:427–447
- Koenig WD, Liebhold AM (2013) Avian predation, pressure as a potential driver of periodical cicada cycle length. *American Naturalist* 181:145–149
- Lauzon MJ, Harper PP (1986) Life history and production of the stream-dwelling mayfly *habrophlebia vibrans* needham (ephemeroptera; leptophlebiidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 64(9):2038–2045
- Lloyd M, Dybas HS (1966) The periodical cicadal problem. ii. evolution. *Evolution* 20:466–505
- May R (1983) Parasitic infections as regulators of animal populations: The dynamic relationship between parasites and their host populations offers clues to the etiology and control of infectious disease. *American Naturalist* 71:36–45
- Ricklefs RE (2008) Disintegration of the ecological community. *American Naturalist* 172:741–750
- Rockwood LL (2015) *Introduction to population biology*. Wiley & Blackwell, Oxford UK
- Roff DA (2002) *Life History Evolution*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland MA
- Stearns SC (1992) *The Evolution of Life Histories*. Oxford University Press, London UK
- Tanaka Y, Yoshimura J, Simon C, Cooley JR, Tainaka K (2009) Allee effect in the selection for prime-numbered cycles in periodical cicadas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 106:8975–8979
- Travis J, Leips J, Rodd HF (2013) Evolution in population parameters: Density-dependent selection or density-dependent fitness? *American Naturalist* 181:s9–s20
- Veller C, Nowak MA, Davis C (2015) Extended flowering intervals of bamboos evolved by discrete multiplication. *Ecology letters* 18:653–659

- Wang W, Franklin SB, Lu Z, Rude B (2016) Delayed flowering in bamboo: evidence from *Fargesia qinlingensis* in the Qinling mountains of China. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 7:151
- Yoshimura J (1997) The evolutionary origins of periodical cicadas during ice ages. *American Naturalist* 149:112–124
- Yoshimura J, Hayashi T, Tanaka Y, Tainaka K, Simon C (2009) Selection for prime-number intervals in a numerical model of periodical cicada evolution. *Evolution* 63:288–294