

# How Lévy flights triggered by presence of defectors affect evolution of cooperation in spatial games

Genki Ichinose<sup>1\*</sup>, Daiki Miyagawa<sup>2</sup>, Erika Chiba<sup>3</sup> and Hiroki Sayama<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematical and Systems Engineering, Shizuoka University, 3-5-1 Johoku, Naka-ku, Hamamatsu, 432-8561, Japan. E-mail: ichinose.genki@shizuoka.ac.jp

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematical and Systems Engineering, Shizuoka University, 3-5-1 Johoku, Naka-ku, Hamamatsu, 432-8561, Japan. E-mail: miyagawa.daiki.18@shizuoka.ac.jp

<sup>3</sup>Graduate School of Informatics, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601, Japan. E-mail: chiba.erika@i.mbox.nagoya-u.ac.jp

<sup>4</sup>Waseda Innovation Lab, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>5</sup>Center for Collective Dynamics of Complex Systems, Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY, USA. E-mail: sayama@binghamton.edu

\* Corresponding author (ichinose.genki@shizuoka.ac.jp)

August 19, 2021

## Abstract

Cooperation among individuals has been key to sustaining societies. However, natural selection favors defection over cooperation. Cooperation can be favored when the mobility of individuals allows cooperators to form a cluster (or group). Mobility patterns of animals sometimes follow a Lévy flight. A Lévy flight is a kind of random walk but it is composed of many small movements with a few big movements. Here, we developed an agent-based model in a square lattice where agents perform Lévy flights depending on the fraction of neighboring defectors. For comparison, we also tested normal-type movements implemented by a uniform distribution. We focus on how the sensitivity to defectors when performing Lévy flights promotes the evolution of cooperation. Results of evolutionary simulations showed that Lévy flights outperformed normal movements for cooperation in all sensitivities. In Lévy flights, cooperation was most promoted when the sensitivity to defectors was moderate. Finally, as the population density became larger, higher sensitivity was more beneficial for cooperation to evolve.

## Keywords

Lévy flight, mobility, evolution of cooperation, spatial game, sensitivity

# 1 Introduction

Cooperative behavior is necessary to sustain human and animal societies [1–3]. However, the previous studies of evolutionary games show that cooperation is not favored by natural selection compared to defection [4, 5]. Therefore, it has been suggested special mechanisms are needed for cooperation to evolve [4]. In the proposed mechanisms, spatial (or network) reciprocity has often been studied [6–12]. In those traditional models, individuals do not move in the spatial environment because all spaces are occupied. Namely, static networks were used for interactions among individuals. In contrast, many biological organisms have the ability to move. Mobility is a fundamental trait of animals and humans because animals forage for food and people often move when they interact. Recently, spatial reciprocity with mobility has attracted great attention and various theoretical models have been developed. Earlier theoretical studies have assumed random (unconditional) movements [13–15]. They revealed that the evolution of cooperation is basically hindered by mobility because it basically destroys cooperative clusters and leads the population to a well-mixed state. On the other hand, they also showed cooperation is sustained in the case of low mobility because it contributes to expand the regions of cooperative clusters. Recent studies showed that cooperation is enhanced even in the random movements for low mobility if the update rules are properly devised [16, 17].

The situation drastically changes if conditional movements have been assumed [18–23, 23, 24]. In this case, each agent monitors its current environmental conditions within its local neighborhood and moves to another location if the conditions are found to be undesirable. In many cases, “undesirable” refers to the situation that there are many defectors within the local neighborhood. This contingent movement enhances the evolution of cooperation even if the mobility rate is high because cooperative clusters tend to be created by keeping a distance from defectors.

In those studies, Tomassini and Antonioni focused on a special mobility type, called a Lévy flight [23]. A Lévy flight is a kind of random walk but it is characterized by many small movements with a few big movements. More formally, the distance of movements follows a power-law distribution. It has been shown that some animal species use Lévy flights when foraging [25–27]. When resources are randomly distributed and there is no information on their locations, a search pattern based on a Lévy flight type is optimal [28]. Another study shows that humans also use Lévy flights [29].

Tomassini and Antonioni studied the evolution of cooperation in spatial games where agents perform Lévy flights [23]. In the model, they assumed two types of conditions where Lévy flights are performed by agents: 1) Agents always perform Lévy flights, 2) agents perform Lévy flights only when more than half of their neighbors are defectors. They showed that cooperation evolved only in the latter case.

Motivated by this study, we focus on the evolution of cooperation of mobile agents that perform Lévy flights in spatial games. Tomassini and Antonioni’s model was a bit extreme in the sense that they only consider both types of conditions for Lévy flights. Here, we consider a continuous range of sensitivity to the presence of defectors to identify the optimal level of Lévy flights for the evolution of cooperation in spatial games. From another perspective, it was unknown whether the power-law characteristic of movement promoted cooperation. Simply, big jumps which are not due to Lévy flights may lead to the evolution of cooperation. To test this case, here we also assume normal-type movements where agents can move to any space regardless of distances with equal probability and compare it with the case of Lévy flights. Finally, we reveal how the sensitivity which yields the optimal cooperation changes depending on the population density.

## 2 Model

We developed an agent-based model of the evolution of cooperation in a square lattice where the sensitivity to neighboring defectors in Lévy flights is adjusted by step functions. First, agents are randomly distributed into an  $L \times L$  lattice. The density of the agents is given by  $\rho$ . Thus, the number of agents is  $N = L^2\rho$ . At the beginning, half of the agents are cooperators and the other half are defectors. Then, the following process is repeated until the specified number of time steps ( $t_{\text{end}} = 500$ ) is obtained.

1. One agent is randomly selected from the whole population. (This agent may be selected multiple times in one time step because we used an asymmetric update scheme.)
2. The agent plays one of four games with its neighbors and obtains the payoff. The neighboring agents also play the game with their neighbors and obtain payoffs (Fig. 1). The detail of these games is described below.
3. The agent imitates the strategy of the neighbor that obtained the highest payoff within the neighborhood, including itself.




Figure 1: Game executions in Step 2.

4. The agent is unsatisfied when the neighbors are defectors. If the fraction of defectors is equal to or greater than a threshold value, it performs a Lévy flight to another cell if the cell is empty. Otherwise, the agent does not move. As a control experiment, instead of a Lévy flight, the agent performs a normal-type movement which means that it moves to another cell regardless of the distance with equal probability if the cell is not occupied. In this case, the potential cell for movement is randomly selected by a uniform distribution.

5. The above is repeated  $N$  times, which is regarded as one time step ( $t$ ).

In Step 2, the agent and its opponent play one of four common two-person, two-strategy, symmetric games. The two strategies are cooperation (C) and defection (D). If both cooperate, they receive  $R$ ; if one cooperates and the other defects, the former obtains  $S$  and the latter obtains  $T$ ; if both defect, they receive  $P$ . The games are classified into the following four depending on the payoff relationships: the Harmony Game (HG);  $R > T, S > P$ , the Stag Hunt (SH);  $R > T > P > S$ , the Prisoner's Dilemma (PD);  $T > R > P > S$ , and the Hawk-Dove game (HD);  $T > R > S > P$ .

In Step 4, the condition of dissatisfaction is provided as follows. We define sensitivity  $s = 1 - \frac{i}{n_{\max}}$  ( $0 \leq s \leq 1$ ) where  $n_{\max}$  denotes the maximum number of agents in the neighborhood, that is,  $n_{\max} = 8$ .  $i$  denotes a threshold value for every level of sensitivity. We consider nine threshold values  $i = 0, 1, \dots, 8$ . Then, we assume the following step functions which decide whether agents perform Lévy flights (or normal-type movements) or not

$$P(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & (1 - \frac{n_D}{n} \leq s) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  denotes the number of agents in the neighborhood and  $n_D$  denotes the number of defectors in the neighborhood.  $P(s)$  is the probability that agents perform Lévy flights (or normal-type movements). From Eq. 1, nine step functions are obtained. When the first equation in Eq. 1 is satisfied, agents perform Lévy flights (or normal-type movements). Note that all agents have the same sensitivity.

The distance of Lévy flights is given by a power-law distribution  $P(d) = d^{-\alpha}$ . We fixed  $d = 2$  in the simulations. Actual observations suggest that animals use  $1 \leq \alpha \leq 3$ .

We use  $L = 50$  and  $\rho = 2/3$  unless otherwise noted. For the game parameters, we fix  $(R, P) = (1, 0)$  while changing  $-1 \leq S \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq T \leq 2$ .

## 3 Result

### 3.1 Lévy flights promote cooperation

First, we focus on whether and how Lévy flights promote cooperation in spatial games. Figure 2 shows the snapshots of the simulation where the sensitivity is  $s = 1/2$ . Here, we set  $(S, T) = (-0.4, 1.4)$ , thus the game is the PD. In the figure, cooperators (defectors) are shown in blue (red). In the early stage of the simulation, cooperators almost go extinct but a few clusters still survive (from  $t = 0$  to 50). If cooperators are clustered, they can obtain higher payoffs within the areas. Thus cooperative clusters can survive. Then, cooperators can expand their areas by moving locally and avoiding defectors based on the adaptive Lévy flights (from  $t = 200$  to 500). Moreover, Lévy flights which consist of rare big movements also benefit cooperation because cooperators can inhabit new areas.

Next, we show how cooperation evolved in the whole  $TS$  plane when  $s = 0, 1/2$ , and 1. Figure 3 shows the average fraction of cooperators, denoted by  $\bar{f}_C$ , at the final step of the simulations ( $t_{\text{end}} = 500$ ). In the right three panels, cooperation evolved when the games were the HG and the SH because cooperation between two




Figure 2: Snapshots of a simulation. Cooperators (Defectors) are shown in blue (red). Initially ( $t = 0$ ), cooperators and defectors are fifty-fifty. Cooperators then almost go extinct but a few cooperative clusters survive. Finally, by utilizing Lévy flights, the cluster of cooperators can invade the sea of defectors. We used the PD game where  $(R, S, T, P) = (1, -0.4, 1.4, 0)$ .  $L = 100$  and  $\rho = 2/3$ .

agents ( $R$ ) is most beneficial. In contrast, cooperation was hard to evolve when the games were the PD and the HD. In those two games, unilateral defection ( $T$ ) is most beneficial. Moreover, defection is the dominant strategy in the PD due to  $T > R$  and  $P > S$ . Thus, the PD resulted in the worst case for cooperation to evolve. When we compare the three results for  $s$  values, cooperation evolved in the moderate sensitivity  $s = 1/2$ .




Figure 3: Fraction of cooperators  $\bar{f}_C$  in the whole  $TS$  plane when  $s = 0, 1/2$ , and 1. The plane is divided into the four games (HG, SH, PD, and HD) depending on the  $T$  and  $S$  values. We averaged 10 simulation runs for each data point.

### 3.2 Optimal sensitivity and comparison with normal-type movement

Here, we try to find out which  $s$  produces the optimal cooperation level in Lévy and normal movements. We changed  $s$  with summing up  $-1 \leq S \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq T \leq 2$ . Figure 4 shows the optimal sensitivities in Lévy (blue line with circle) and normal (gray line with triangle) movements. In the figure, we first found that Lévy flights outperform normal movements in any sensitivity  $s$ . Whether cooperative clusters remain may be related to this result. Cooperators need to be clustered to survive. In Lévy flights, agents often move to nearby cells while big movements are rare. Thus, cooperative clusters are not destroyed once they arise. In contrast, when normal movements are used, there is no difference regarding the probability between small and big movements. Hence, cooperative clusters are easy to be destroyed compared to Lévy flights.

Next, we focus on sensitivity  $s$ . In both cases, the moderate sensitivity most promoted cooperation. In Lévy flights,  $s = 1/2$  was best and for normal movements  $s = 3/8$ . Again, how cooperative clusters remain is important. Too much sensitivity is bad because it prevents cooperators from clustering. Especially, when  $s = 1$ , agents (both cooperators and defectors) continue to move at all times. On the other hand, with quite low sensitivity, cooperators can form clusters but they will eventually be invaded by defectors because, with this sensitivity, cooperators are too patient with defectors. As a result, moderate sensitivity works better for cooperators to keep their clusters in both movement types.

### 3.3 Change of optimal sensitivities depending on densities

Finally, we focus on how cooperation evolves depending on density  $\rho$  in both movement types. Figure 5 shows  $\bar{f}_C$  when sensitivity  $s$  and density  $\rho$  were changed. As seen in the figure, Lévy flights promoted cooperation com-




Figure 4: Fraction of cooperators  $\bar{f}_{C_{all}}$  as a function of sensitivity  $s$  where  $\bar{f}_{C_{all}}$  is obtained by averaging all  $\bar{f}_C$  in the whole parameter ranges ( $0 \leq T \leq 2$  and  $-1 \leq S \leq 1$ ). Blue line with circles corresponds to Lévy flights while grey line with triangles corresponds to normal movements. For each point on the lines, 10 simulation runs are averaged. Cooperation was promoted the most in the moderate sensitivity  $s = 1/2$ . We averaged 10 simulation runs for each data point.

pared to normal movements as a whole (red regions in Lévy flights are larger than those in normal movements). As explained in the previous section, this is because cooperative clusters tend to remain in Lévy flights.

Next, we examine the effect of density on cooperation. When the sensitivity was at its highest  $s = 1$ , cooperation did not evolve at all in both cases. When the sensitivity was too low  $s \leq 1/4$ , cooperation did not evolve much. Thus, even when the density was changed, moderate sensitivities  $1/4 \leq s < 7/8$  were best for cooperation to evolve.

Moreover, as the density became larger, higher sensitivity promoted more cooperation in both cases. In sparse situations (low densities), cooperative clusters tend to be maintained because they are surrounded by few defectors. In contrast, in dense situations, cooperative clusters tend to be destroyed by surrounding defectors. In that case, it is better for cooperators to escape from their current positions by moving to other cells. Thus, higher sensitivity can promote cooperation in the dense situations.

## 4 Conclusion

We investigated the effect of how sensitivity to defectors when performing Lévy flights promotes the evolution of cooperation. We constructed an agent-based model where agents play games with their neighbors, update their strategies, and perform Lévy flights to move to other cells in a square lattice. Compared to the previous work, we tested various levels of sensitivity to defectors for the condition of Lévy flights and analyzed the relationship between the sensitivity and density for cooperation. We also checked how the difference of movement types affect cooperation by comparing Lévy flights and normal movements. The evolutionary simulations showed the following three facts. First, Lévy flights outperformed normal movements as a whole. Second, cooperation was most promoted in the moderate sensitivity. Finally, as the density increased, higher sensitivity to defectors was better for cooperation to evolve.

We previously suggested that big jumps promoted cooperation in spatial games [24]. However, in that study, agents tended to move to distant cells as the fraction of neighboring defectors became high. Namely, the distances of jumps were the functions of neighboring defectors. Therefore, a relatively high cognitive ability was required because agents had to have not only the detection of neighboring environments but also the desire which kept them at a distance from defectors. Contrary to this previous work, in this study, mobile agents only require a simple cognitive ability which is the detection of neighboring environments because jump distances do not depend on the fraction of the defectors. Even in this case, we showed that cooperation sufficiently evolved. Thus, our study highlights the possibility of the evolution of cooperation in biological mobile organisms which have simple cognitive abilities. We can include a desire for agents to keep a distance from defectors into the current model, which is one direction of a future work.

## 5 Acknowledgments

This work is support by HAYAO NAKAYAMA Foundation for Science & Technology and Culture .

## References

- [1] D.G. Rand and M.A. Nowak. Human cooperation. *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, 17:413–425, 2013.
- [2] L.A. Dugatkin. *Cooperation Among Animals: An Evolutionary Perspective*. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [3] T. Clutton-Brock. Cooperation between non-kin in animal societies. *Nature*, 462:51–57, 2009.
- [4] M.A. Nowak. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 314:1560–1563, 2006.
- [5] M. A. Nowak. *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.
- [6] M.A. Nowak and R.M May. Evolutionary games and spatial chaos. *Nature*, 359:826–829, 1992.
- [7] F.C. Santos and J.M. Pacheco. Scale-free networks provide a unifying framework for the emergence of cooperation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95:098104, 2005.
- [8] G. Szabó and G. Fáth. Evolutionary games on graphs. *Phys. Rep.*, 446:97–216, 2007.
- [9] C.P. Roca, J.A. Cuesta, and A. Sánchez. Evolutionary game theory: Temporal and spatial effects beyond replicator dynamics. *Phys. Life Rev.*, 6:208–249, 2009.
- [10] H. Ohtsuki, C. Hauert, E. Lieberman, and M. Nowak. A simple rule for the evolution of cooperation on graphs and social networks. *Nature*, 441:502–505, 2006.
- [11] M. Perc and A. Szolnoki. Coevolutionary games - a minireview. *Biosystems*, 99:109–125, 2010.
- [12] M. Perc, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, A. Szolnoki, L.M. Floría, and Y. Moreno. Evolutionary dynamics of group interactions on structured populations: a review. *J R. Soc. Interface*, 10:20120997, 2013.
- [13] M. Enquist and O. Leimar. The evolution of cooperation in mobile organisms. *Anim. Behav.*, 45:747–757, 1993.




Figure 5: Fraction of cooperators  $\bar{f}_C$  as functions of densities and sensitivity. Top: Lévy flights. Bottom: Normal movements. PD game with  $(R, S, T, P) = (1, -0.4, 1.2, 0)$  was used. We averaged 10 simulation runs for each data point.

- [14] A. Traulsen and M.A. Nowak. Evolution of cooperation by multilevel selection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 103:10952-10955, 2006.
- [15] M.H. Vainstein, A.T.C. Silva, and J.A. Jeferson. Does mobility decrease cooperation? *J. Theor. Biol.*, 244:722-728, 2007.
- [16] E.A. Sicardi, H. Fort, T. M.H. Vainstein, and J.J. Arenzon. Random mobility and spatial structure often enhance cooperation. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 256:240-246, 2009.
- [17] A. Antonioni, M. Tomassini, and P. Buesser. Random diffusion and cooperation in continuous two-dimensional space. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 344:40-48, 2014.
- [18] C.A. Aktipis. Know when to walk away: contingent movement and the evolution of cooperation. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 231:249-260, 2004.
- [19] P. Buesser, M. Tomassini, and A. Antonioni. Opportunistic migration in spatial evolutionary games. *Phys. Rev. E*, 88:88, 2013.
- [20] D. Helbing and W. Yu. The outbreak of cooperation among success-driven individuals under noisy conditions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 106:3680-3685, 2009.
- [21] L.-L. Jiang, W.-X. Wang, Y.-C. Lai, and B.-H. Wang. Role of adaptive migration in promoting cooperation in spatial games. *Phys. Rev. E*, 81:036108, 2010.
- [22] C.P. Roca and D. Helbing. Emergence of social cohesion in a model society of greedy, mobile individuals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 108:11370-11374, 2011.
- [23] M. Tomassini and A. Antonioni. Lévy flights and cooperation among mobile individuals. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 364:154-161, 2015.
- [24] G. Ichinose, M. Saito, H. Sayama, and D.S. Wilson. Adaptive long-range migration promotes cooperation under tempting conditions. *Sci. Rep.*, 3:2509, 2013.
- [25] G.M. Viswanathan, S.V. Buldyrev, S. Havlin, M.G.E. da Luz, E.P. Raposo, and H.E. Stanley. Optimizing the success of random searches. *Nature*, 401:911-914, 1999.
- [26] G.M. Viswanathan, V. Afanasyev, S.V. Buldyrev, E.J. Murphy, P.A. Prince, and H.E. Stanley. Lévy flight search patterns of wandering albatrosses. *Nature*, 381:413-415, 1996.
- [27] D. W. Sims, N. E. Humphries, R. W. Bradford, and B. D. Bruce. Lévy flight and brownian search patterns of a free-ranging predator reflect different prey field characteristics. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 81:432-442, 2012.
- [28] M. A. Lomholt, K. Tal, R. Metzler, and K. Joseph. Lévy strategies in intermittent search processes are advantageous. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 105:11055-11059, 2008.
- [29] D. Brockmann, L. Hufnagel, and T. Geisel. The scaling laws of human travel. *Nature*, 439:462-465, 2006.