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Abstract

Studies on the evolution of cooperation among a population of individuals are essential in evolutionary dynamics. Population structure is a key factor affecting the evolution of cooperation. Temporal networks with randomly active nodes and edges have been demonstrated to facilitate the evolution of cooperation relative to their static counterparts. However, the evolution of temporal networks is usually accompanied by the successive growth of nodes and edges instead of random activations. Here, we first consider sequential temporal networks with individuals entering them successively and study evolutionary dynamics on the networks. We derive explicit conditions under which sequential temporal networks promote the evolution of cooperation. Specifically, we discover systematical characteristics of new nodes and edges during the network evolution, which provide the advantage of sequential temporal networks in favoring cooperation. Finally, we confirm that both synthetic and empirical data present such advantages on sequential temporal networks. Our results advance the study of evolutionary dynamics on temporal networks theoretically, which is pivotal to foster the evolution of cooperation.

1 Introduction

The evolution of cooperation has been widely studied in recent years to explore the emergence and persistence of cooperative behaviors existing from microbial systems to human society \cite{1, 2, 3}. Serving as a powerful mathematical framework, the evolutionary game theory is widely adopted \cite{4, 5, 6, 7, 8}. Previous results show that the underlying population structure plays a key role in the evolution of cooperation \cite{9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18}. The population structure is often modeled by a network, where nodes and edges represent individuals and mutual interactions, respectively.

The elementary setting for most previous findings is that the network structure is static. However, real-life networks, especially human contact networks, tend to be time-varying and are called temporal networks whose links are active only at certain points in time. The emergence of a large amount of empirical data such as email communications \cite{19}, human mobility \cite{20, 21}, and phone calls \cite{22}, indicates that the phenomenon of time-dependent changes in underlying topologies is common in real systems. Interestingly, results in Ref. \cite{23} show that empirical temporal networks promote the evolution of cooperation when nodes and edges in temporal networks become active randomly.

Of particular note is that the mechanism for the successive growth of network nodes plays an important role in the evolution of networks. Many classic models of network construction follow the
above mechanism, like the Barabási-Albert model \cite{24} where one adds a new node at each time step (growth) and links it to another \( m \) different nodes in the network with preferential attachment. All other similar models share the following characteristics: nodes enter the network sequentially and interact with other nodes during the formation of the network \cite{25, 27}. These characteristics specify rules for the assembly process of agents, which is also widely prevalent in real systems. Examples include information diffusion \cite{28, 30}, where nodes receive information sequentially according to the distance to the spreaders in social networks and the response time, and the assembly of microbiome communities like gut microbiota aggregation \cite{31, 33}. Nevertheless, until recently, notable research on these temporal networks is still missing.

Here we aim to study the evolution of cooperation on temporal networks with an increasing number of nodes and edges and compare the evolution of cooperation with the corresponding static networks. In the sequel, we first describe the construction of temporal networks. Then we study the fixation probability of cooperation on temporal networks and the conditions that temporal networks can foster the evolution of cooperation under different intensities of selection. Finally, we validate the generality of our results on empirical and synthetic temporal networks.

2 Sequential temporal network construction

The construction of a temporal network requires the input of an undirected network \( G \) with \( N \) nodes and a vector set \( \mathbf{A} = \{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}^{(T)}\} \). The static network \( G \) is specified by its adjacency matrix \( A \). The element \( \mathbf{a}^{(t)} = (a^{(t)}_{i,j})_{i=1}^{N} \in \mathbb{R}^N \) in \( \mathbf{A} \) is a vector, where \( a^{(t)}_{i,j} = 1 \) if the node \( i \) is activated at time \( t \), otherwise \( a^{(t)}_{i,j} = 0 \). \( T \) is the length of the duration time of the temporal network (i.e. the number of snapshots). The temporal network generated by \( G \) and \( \mathbf{A} \) is denoted as \( \mathcal{G} = \{G^{(1)}, \ldots, G^{(T)}\} \), where the active number of nodes in the snapshot \( G^{(t)} \) is \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} a^{(t)}_{i} \), and the corresponding adjacency matrix is \( A^{(t)} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}^{(t)}).A.\text{diag}(\mathbf{a}^{(t)}) \). Furthermore, we define a partial ordering \( \preceq \) on \( \mathbb{R}^N \). The relation \( x = (x_i)_{i=1}^{N} \preceq y = (y_i)_{i=1}^{N} \) holds when \( x_i \leq y_i \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq N \). If \( \mathbf{a}^{(t_1)} \preceq \mathbf{a}^{(t_2)} \) for all \( 1 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T \) and the adjacency matrix of the last snapshot \( A^{(T)} \) is equal to \( A \) (i.e. \( G^{(T)} = G \)), then \( \mathcal{G} \) is called a sequential temporal network. All the temporal networks discussed in this work are sequential temporal networks.

3 Evolutionary model

We model interactions between individuals in terms of two-player games in which both players can choose a strategy of cooperation (C) and defection (D) when interacting with each other. Here we focus on the donation game \cite{6}, in which cooperators pay a cost \( c \) to donate \( b \); defectors then pay no cost and provide no benefit. These outcomes can be represented by the payoff matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
C & D \\
C & -c \\
D & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

For \( b > c > 0 \), this game is a Prisoners’ Dilemma \cite{4}.

The state of a population with \( N \) active nodes is denoted by \( \mathbf{x} = (x_1,\ldots,x_N)^T \in \{0,1\}^N \), where \( x_i = 1 \) (\( x_i = 0 \)) indicates that the strategy of individual \( i \) is C (D). Each individual \( i \) plays the game with each neighbor and receives an average payoff of \( u_i(\mathbf{x}) = -cx_i + b \sum_j p_{ij}x_j \), where \( p_{ij} = w_{ij}/\sum_k w_{ik} \) and \( w_{ij} \) is the weight of edge \((i,j)\). The fitness of individual \( i \) is denoted by \( F_i(\mathbf{x}) = 1 + \delta u_i(\mathbf{x}) \), where \( \delta \geq 0 \) is the intensity of selection. We claim that the intensity of selection is neutral or weak when \( \delta = 0 \) or \( \delta \ll 1 \).
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Figure 1: Illustration of two typical evolutionary processes on a sequential temporal network. The construction of the temporal network begins with a three-node network, and initial states are set randomly with a cooperator (C, red). After \( G \) rounds of evolution, new nodes with strategy defection (D, blue) and edges (dashed lines) are added to the present network (intermediate states). The evolutionary processes end in the final states when the structure of the present network is the same as the pre-given static network and the state of the population becomes full of C or D. a In each snapshot, the state is renewed according to a given updating rule until the state reaches an absorbing state (all C or all D), then the network changes. b In each snapshot except the last one, the state is updated \( g \) rounds before switching to the next snapshot, and in the last snapshot, the update continues until the whole network reaches an absorbing state. In particular, when \( g = \infty \), these two evolutionary processes are the same.

To explore the effect of sequential temporal networks on the evolution of cooperation compared to the traditional static counterparts [3,16,34], here we employ a commonly used updating rule called death-Birth (dB) process. At each time step, a random individual is chosen uniformly to die and its neighbors then compete for the empty site proportionally to their fitness. After a sufficiently long period of time, the state will become \( x = (1, \ldots, 1)^T \) (all C) or \( x = (0, \ldots, 0)^T \) (all D), these two states are called absorbing states [35]. For a particular initial configuration \( \xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_N)^T \in \{0, 1\}^N \), the probability of reaching all C (all D) from \( \xi \) is represented by \( \rho_\xi^C (\rho_\xi^D) \), which is the fixation probability for C (D). Another important initialization is called uniform initialization [3,16], meaning that a single C is chosen uniformly at random in a population full of D, and the fixation probability for C (D) in this case is denoted as \( \rho_\mu^C (\rho_\mu^D) \).

Considering the fixation probability is related to \( \delta \), we indicate each variable under neutral (weak) selection with a superscript \(^\circ \) (\(^* \)).

We consider two different evolutionary processes on sequential temporal networks. Figure 1 illustrates the essence of the two processes. In first evolutionary process, new node(s) will not enter the system until the state reaches absorbing states (Fig. 1a). The evolution in each snapshot is sufficient, namely, the game is played in infinite rounds over each snapshot. In the second one, the timescale of the evolutionary dynamics on each snapshot except the last one is controlled by the parameter \( g \), which captures the number of rounds in each snapshot (Fig. 1b).

Here, we first calculate the fixation probabilities for C of a sequential temporal network \( G \) and the corresponding static network \( G \) under the first evolutionary process. The fixation probability
Figure 2: Fixation probability of cooperation on sequential temporal networks is higher than that on the corresponding static networks for different types of networks. a Simulation results of fixation probability under weak selection. Networks are square lattices, random regular graphs with average connectivity \( k \), attractiveness models with initial attractiveness \( a \) and linking number \( m \) \cite{26} and scale-free networks generated by the Barabási-Albert model with linking number \( m \) \cite{24}. b-d Three different cases show the correctness of Eq. (3). The results are obtained by theoretical calculation under neutral drift. All networks in a have size \( N = 100 \) and other parameter values are \( c = 1 \), \( \delta = 0.025 \), \( k = 6 \), \( a = 50 \) and \( m = 3 \).

for \( C \) of \( G \) can be formulated as

\[
\rho_C(G) = \rho_C(G^{(1)}) \prod_{t=2}^{T} \rho_C^{(t)}(G^{(t)}),
\]

where \( \xi^{(t)}(i) = a^{(t-1)} \) for all \( 2 \leq i \leq T \) and \( a^{(t)} \) is an element of \( A \). For consistency, the initialization of \( G \) is also uniform and the fixation probability for \( C \) of \( G \) is denoted as \( \rho_C(G) \). We say that the temporal network \( G \) promotes the evolution of cooperation if:

\[
\rho_C(G) > \rho_C(G),
\]

since the probability of a single cooperator eventually taking over the population in \( G \) is higher than that in the corresponding static network \( G \). Then, we investigate the relation between the fixation probability for \( C \) in \( G \) and the parameter \( g \). In this case, the fixation probability is denoted as \( \rho_C(G,g) \). The simulation results are obtained by performing Monte Carlo simulations. For each static or temporal network, we average over \( 10^6 \) independent trials. For each trial, we run the game for \( 10^7 \) steps for the first process (Fig. 1a) and \( g \) steps for the second process (Fig. 1b) over each snapshot except the last one.

4 Results

We start by considering the fixation probabilities for \( C \) on synthetic networks. Figure 2a shows the fixation probability for \( C \) times the network size \( (N\rho_C) \) of four static networks and the corresponding sequential temporal networks (see Ref. \cite{36} for details of the construction) under weak selection. For these four networks, the fixation probability of the sequential temporal networks
is greater than that of the static networks, demonstrating that the sequential temporal networks promote the evolution of cooperation. And the relative magnitude and monotonicity of $\rho_C$ in terms of the benefit-to-cost ratio $b/c$ on the temporal networks remain the same as that on the static counterparts. However, the cost of increasing $\rho_C$ on sequential temporal networks is that the expected time for reaching one of the absorption states (i.e. absorbing time) becomes longer compared to static networks [36].

Next, we seek to derive the condition of $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C(G)^*$ on sequential temporal networks theoretically. We first focus on the case of $T = 2$, then Eq. (1) becomes $\rho_C(G) = \rho_C(G^{(1)})\rho_C(G^{(2)})$ and $\rho_C(G) = \rho_C(G^{(2)})$. Since $pc(G)^* > \rho_C(G)^*$, we first analyze the case of $\delta = 0$. We assume that $G^{(1)} (G^{(2)})$ has $m$ $(m + \Delta m)$ nodes and the average connectivity is $k_1$ $(k_2)$. The difference in the number of edges of two adjacent snapshots is denoted as $\Delta K$, then we have $\Delta K = [(m + \Delta m)k_2 - mk_1]/2$. When there are no interconnected edges between $\Delta m$ nodes, Eq. (2) holds under neutral drift if and only if one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

\begin{equation}
(i) \quad \Delta m \geq m,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(ii) \quad \Delta m < m, \quad \Delta K < \frac{m\Delta mk_1}{m-\Delta m}.
\end{equation}

When $\Delta m \ll m$, the second condition (ii) degenerates to $\Delta K < \Delta mk_1$. The first condition (i) shows if the number of nodes added at the next snapshot ($\Delta m$) is not less than the original number ($m$), sequential temporal networks promote the evolution of cooperation. The second condition (ii) shows when $\Delta m$ and the number of newly added edges ($\Delta K$) is less than the product of the number of newly added nodes and the average connectivity of the earlier snapshot, the cooperation is promoted by sequential temporal networks. When the number of snapshots is larger than 3 (i.e. $T \geq 3$), a sufficient condition for $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C(G)^*$ is that each adjacent snapshots satisfy Eq. (3) (Figs. 2b-2c). Similarly, when none of adjacent snapshots satisfies Eq. (3), we have $\rho_C(G)^* \leq \rho_C(G)^*$ (Fig. 2d).

Using Eq. (3), we find that the evolution of cooperation on sequential temporal networks is strongly correlated with the specific change in network topology over time. When the number of nodes grows exponentially, the evolution of cooperation is promoted on sequential temporal networks. When the growth rate of nodes ($\Delta m$) is slow, the corresponding increase of edges ($\Delta K$) needs to be upper bounded in order to promote the evolution of cooperation. Intuitively, since the newly added nodes are all defectors, it is essential to avoid the emergence of hubs from new nodes to promote the evolution of cooperation. Hence the new nodes are not allowed to carry too many edges to enter the network.

When $\rho_C(G)^* = \rho_C(G)^*$, the exact condition of $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C(G)^*$ is complicated to verify numerically on large networks. Here we offer a mean-field approximation [34] to obtain a computationally feasible condition.

The first-order coefficients of $\rho_C^1$ and $\rho_C^2$ expanded at $\delta = 0$ are given as

\begin{align*}
f^i(G^{(i)}) &= \frac{1}{N} \left[-c \left( \frac{B_0N\mu_1^2}{\mu_2} - \frac{C_0 + C_1}{N\mu_1} \right) + b \left( \frac{B_0\mu_1}{\mu_2} - \frac{C_1 + C_2}{N\mu_1} \right) \right] \bigg|_{G^{(i)}},
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
f^m(G^{(i)}) &= \frac{1}{N} \left[-c \left( \frac{N\mu_1^2}{2\mu_2} - 1 \right) + b \left( \frac{\mu_1\Lambda}{2\mu_2} - 1 \right) \right] \bigg|_{G^{(i)}},
\end{align*}

where $N = \left[ \begin{array}{c} N \mu_1^2 \mu_2 & 0 \end{array} \right]$. The first-order coefficients of $\rho_C^1$ and $\rho_C^2$ expanded at $\delta = 0$ are given as
and the condition for $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C^e(G)^*$ when $T = 2$ is

$$\frac{1}{N} \left| G(1) \right| \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{\alpha}^{(i)}(G(2)) + \xi \left| G(2) \right| f_{\mu}^{(1)}(G(1)) > f_{\mu}^{(2)}(G(2)).$$

The notation $\left| G^{(i)} \right|$ indicates that the value is taken under $G^{(i)}$. $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are the first and second moments of the network degree distribution, respectively. $\Lambda$ is a function of $G^{(i)}$, and other notations $B_0$, $C_i (i = 0, 1, 2)$ and $\hat{\xi}$ are functions of $\xi$ and $G^{(i)}$. The details of these notations can be found in Ref. [36].

We next move to the study of the second evolutionary process. Figure 3 shows how the cooperation evolves when the number of rounds $g$ over each snapshot changes. The fixation probabilities increase monotonically with $g$ on four types of sequential temporal networks. When $g \to \infty$, the results converge to the first evolutionary process. Heterogeneous networks (green and purple lines) converge faster than homogeneous networks (blue and yellow lines), and the stable values are also higher. By showing $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C^e(G)^*$, these results explain why the evolution of cooperation can be promoted under the temporal version of these networks. Under weak selection, the monotonicity and convergence of $\rho_C$ with respect to $g$ still exist in a large range of $b/c$ [36].

To validate our theoretical results on real networks, we collect four empirical datasets of social interactions from SocioPatterns [37], and construct the corresponding static networks and sequential temporal networks (See Ref. [36] for further discussion of construction). Figure 4 shows the simulation results on these real networks. In each panel, we observe that $\rho_C(G)^* > \rho_C^e(G)^*$, meaning that the sequential temporal networks facilitate the evolution of cooperation in human contact networks. We notice that the fixation probabilities are higher than in the static networks as long as the evolutionary dynamics is temporal ($g \geq 1$). Thus, to foster the emergence of cooperation, each snapshot does not need to be fully evolved empirically (i.e. $g = \infty$). In addition, the top and bottom panels of Fig. 4 have the opposite monotonicity to $b/c$, and the monotonicity in temporal and static networks is consistent. In a static or sequential temporal network, the critical benefit-cost ratio $(b/c)^*$ determines the monotonicity. When $(b/c)^* > 0 ((b/c)^* < 0)$, $\rho_C$ increases (decreases) monotonically with respect to $b/c$. As $(b/c)^*$ of a large network is complicated to calculate accurately, we demonstrate that the monotonicity of $\rho_C$ can be obtained by calculating the approximate value of $(b/c)^*$ using the mean-field approximation [36].
Figure 4: Fixation probability for cooperation on both static and sequential temporal networks generated by real data. The datasets are from different social contexts: a scientific conference in Nice, France (SFHH), the Science Gallery in Dublin, Ireland (InC), a workplace with data collected in two different years in France (InVS13, InVS15) (see Refs. [38, 39] for more details). Parameter values are $\delta = 0.025$ in SFHH, $\delta = 0.01$ in the rest of datasets and $c = 1$.

5 Discussion

Inspired by real-life scenarios such as information diffusion [28–30] and mathematical models such as network evolution [24–27], we study the evolution of cooperation on sequential temporal networks where new nodes and edges successively enter the corresponding systems. The whole construction records the evolution of static networks.

We present two typical evolutionary processes on sequential temporal networks and compare the fixation probability for cooperation with corresponding static networks. Based on the first evolutionary process, we derive the conditions that sequential temporal networks promote the evolution of cooperation under both neutral drift and weak selection. Under neutral drift, the conditions are that the increment of nodes for each adjacent snapshots $G^{(t)}, G^{(t+1)}$ is greater than the number of nodes of $G^{(t)}$, or the increment of edges is dominated by the product of the increment of nodes and the average connectivity of $G^{(t)}$. These conditions require that the growth rate of nodes are exponential or newly added nodes refrain from becoming hubs in each snapshot. Under weak selection, we offer a theoretical method with a mean-field approximation to derive the condition. This method provides an effective way to calculate the fixation probability, critical benefit-to-cost ratio, and the structure coefficient of large static and sequential temporal networks, while also ensuring high accuracy [36].

Based on the second evolutionary process, we explore the relationship between the fixation probability and the parameter controlling the timescale of the evolution in each snapshot. We find that the fixation probability on sequential temporal networks is monotonically increasing with respect to the parameter, showing that adequate evolution in each snapshot can provide advantages for the emergence of cooperation.

According to the rule we defined, we generate sequential temporal networks based on real network datasets and several kinds of synthetic algorithms for generating classic static networks. The simulation results on the synthetic and empirical temporal networks support our view that sequential temporal networks facilitate the emergence of cooperation. Moreover, we find that even if the evolution is not sufficient in each snapshot, the empirical sequential temporal networks still promote the evolution of cooperation to their corresponding static networks. These findings provide the evidence for the advantage of sequential temporal networks in promoting cooperative behaviors and deepen our understanding on the importance of the way of network evolution on the fate of cooperators in real systems.
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