

K. Argasinski\*

Institute of Mathematics of Polish Academy of Sciences

ul. Śniadeckich 8

00-656 Warszawa

Department of Mathematics, University of Sussex,

Brighton BN1 9QH, UK.

M. Broom

Department of Mathematics, City, University of London,

Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK.

Mark.Broom.1@city.ac.uk

\*corresponding author



**CAUTION!**

This manuscript is the **work-in-progress** version submitted for review. Note that the final version may contain new results/corrections.

In case if some parts of this text are unclear/contain errors/make no sense please report this to the authors.

**Abstract**

In this paper we present a new modelling framework combining replicator dynamics (which is the standard model of frequency dependent selection) with the model of an age-structured population. The new framework allows for the modelling of populations consisting of competing strategies carried by individuals who change across their life cycle.

Firstly the discretization of the McKendrick von Foerster model is derived. It is shown that the Euler–Lotka equation is satisfied when the new model reaches a steady state (i.e. stable frequencies between the age classes). This discretization consists of the unit age classes and the timescale is chosen that only a fraction of individuals play single game round. This implies linear dynamics within single time unit when individuals not killed during game round are moved from one age class to another. Since its local linear behaviour the system is equivalent to large Bernadelli-Lewis-Leslie matrix. Then the methodology of multipopulation games is used for the derivation of two, mutually equivalent systems of equations. The first contains equations describing the evolution of the strategy frequencies in the whole population completed by subsystems of equations describing the evolution of the age structure for each strategy. The second system contains equations describing the changes of the general population’s age structure, completed with subsystems of equations describing the selection of the strategies within each age class. Then the obtained system of replicator dynamics is presented in the form of the mixed ODE-PDE system which is independent of the chosen timescale and much simpler. The obtained results are illustrated by example of the sex ratio model which shows that when different mortalities of both sexes are assumed, the sex ratio of 0.5 is obtained but that Fisher’s mechanism driven by the reproductive value of the different sexes is not in equilibrium.

---

**Acknowledgements:**

The project was realized under the grants Marie Curie Actions PIEF-GA-2009-253845 by European Commission and 2013/08/S/NZ8/00821 FUGA 2 by the Polish National Science Centre. We want to thank Jan Kozłowski, John McNamara, Franjo Weissing for support for the projects and Mats Gyllenberg and Ryszard Rudnicki for helpful suggestions.

**1 Introduction**

Among the most important approaches to the modelling of evolutionary processes are life history optimization and evolutionary games. The classical approach to life history theory (Stearns 1992, Roff 1992) relies on optimization models, where there are no interactions among individuals or density dependence:

*“Life history evolution usually ignores density and frequency dependence. The justification is convenience, not logic, or realism”* (Stearns 1992).

On the other hand, in classical game theoretic models there is no age or stage structure. Payoffs describe the averaged lifetime activity of an individual, which can be found for example in Cressman (1992):

*“...an individual’s strategy is fixed over its lifetime or, alternatively, the life history of an individual is its strategy.”*

Thus the synthesis of those both perspectives can be very fruitful and profitable for theoretical insight (McNamara 2013). Methods used in life history optimization are closely related to classical demographic methods such as Bernadelli-Lewis-Leslie matrices (Caswell 2001). However, how to construct a general description of the relationships between demographic structure and population dynamics is still an unsolved problem (Caswell 2011). More precise than matrix models are continuous approaches arising from the Lotka’s renewal

equation (Lotka 1911, Diekmann et al. 2020a, 2020b) and McKendrick von Foerster model (McKendrick 1926). The combination of demography with a game theoretic perspective focused on frequency dependent selection, advocated by McNamara (2013) can be very useful since demographers are interested in the patterns produced by heterogeneity in the populations (Vaupel et al. 1979, Vaupel and Yashin 1983, Hougaard 1984, Vaupel and Yashin 1985). The game theoretic structure can explain the mechanisms shaping those patterns. The first papers combining both approaches are Garay et. al (2016) devoted to the particular biological problem of sib cannibalism, Li et al. (2015) and Lessard and Soares (2017) containing the approach incorporating age structure into a matrix game. These results show that after introduction of the age structure, matrix notation becomes very complicated and makes analysis difficult even in the case of two competing strategies and few age classes.

Another problem is that game theoretic models operate in abstract terms of costs and benefits measured in units of fitness mostly without deeper insight into their meaning or interpretation. This problem was analyzed in Argasinski and Broom (2012) where relationships between classical demography and evolutionary games are described in detail. This approach was later clarified in Argasinski and Broom (2018a, 2018b) by definition of the vital rates (birth and growth rates) as the product of the interaction rates, describing the distribution of interactions (game rounds) in time and demographic game payoffs describing the number of offspring and the probability of death during a single interaction. The main conclusion there is that instead of the excess from average fitness, models should be described explicitly by mortality and fertility, which are basic opposite forces shaping population dynamics. These results are significant progress in ecological realism, emphasizing the role of background mortality and fertility or the turnover of individuals (Argasinski and Kozłowski, 2008). However, that approach is still very primitive. Mor-

tality is described as an exponential decay of the population, which implies that the length of an individual's lifetime is potentially unbounded, and there is no aging and no age specific payoffs. The goal of this paper is to fill this gap and develop a mathematical structure combining selection of individual strategies with an age structured population which will allow us to overcome the problems arising from increasing complexity of the models shown in Li et al. (2015).

### 1.1 The classical approach to evolutionary game theory and the replicator dynamics

In the following subsections, we describe the state of the art in relation to our problem. A list of existing (and indeed new, see later) parameters are described in Table 1. Traditionally, in evolutionary game theory payoff obtained by  $j$ th strategy is proportional to its Malthusian growth rate  $r_j$  and the dynamics of selection of strategies is described by *replicator dynamics* (Maynard Smith 1982, Cressman 1992, Hofbauer and Sigmund 1988 and 1998, Weibull 1995, Nowak 2006). We can derive it by rescaling Malthusian equations for competing strategies  $\dot{n}_j = n_j r_j$  to relative frequencies  $q_j = n_j/n$  (where  $n = \sum_{j=1}^w n_j$  and  $w$  is the number of strategies), which leads to

$$\dot{q}_j = q_j(r_j - \bar{r}) \quad (1)$$

where  $\bar{r} = \sum_{j=1}^w q_j r_j$  is the average payoff in the population. However, instead of the Malthusian parameter describing the payoff we can explicitly consider the individual fertility  $f_j$  and individual mortality  $d_j$  of a  $j$ -strategist. The explicit distinction between fertility and mortality was proposed also by Doebeli et al (2017) as the cornerstone of a mechanistic model of natural selection. Note that in the real life organisms are involved in different types of interac-

tions with other organisms or elements of environment. Game theoretic models are focused on the outcomes of the particular interactions (such as fights as in the Hawk Dove game) responsible for selection of the analyzed trait or the type of behaviour. Those outcomes can be described by average demographic outcomes per interaction  $f_i$  and  $d_i$  and those focal interaction will occur at the rate  $\tau_f$ . Other interactions, not related to the analyzed trait can be described by average fertility  $f_b$  and mortality  $d_b$  and they will occur at the average interaction rate  $\tau_b$ . Products of interaction rates and demographic payoffs will constitute the respective *vital rates*: game fertility rate  $\tau_f f_i$  and mortality rate  $\tau_f d_i$ , background fertility rate  $\tau_b f_b$  and mortality rate  $\tau_b d_b$ . Later focal game interaction rate  $\tau_f$  can be set to 1 by timescale adjustment and the background fertility and mortality rates become  $\Phi = \tau_b f_b / \tau_f$  and  $\Psi = \tau_b d_b / \tau_f$ . In addition we can add density dependent juvenile recruitment survival (Argasinski and Kozłowski 2008, Argasinski and Broom 2012, 2017a, 2018). To do this we should multiply by logistic suppression coefficient  $(1 - n/K)$  (where the carrying capacity  $K$  is interpreted as the maximal environmental load, Hui 2006) fertilities only, not the whole growth rates. In effect the turnover of generations will be not suppressed at the equilibrium as it is in the classical logistic model, which leads to the immortal and childless population at equilibrium  $K$ . These assumptions lead to the following variant of the replicator equations:

$$\dot{q}_j = q_j((f_j - \bar{f}) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - (d_j - \bar{d})) \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{n} = n([\bar{f} + \Phi] \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - \bar{d} + \Psi), \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{f} = \sum_{j=1}^w q_j f_j$  and  $\bar{d} = \sum_{j=1}^w q_j d_j$ , the details of which appear in Argasinski and Broom (2012, 2017a, 2018).

It was shown (Argasinski 2006) that every single population system described by the replicator equations (1) can be divided into the product of subsystems

describing the dynamics in arbitrary chosen subpopulations (described by a frequencies  $q_j^i = n_j^i/n_j$ , where  $n_j = \sum_i n_j^i$ , for the  $j$ -th subpopulation) and an additional system describing the dynamics of proportions between those subpopulations  $p = n_j/\sum_j n_j$ . The dynamics in each subpopulation will have the form (1) and will depend on the excess of the strategy payoff from the average payoff in this subpopulation. Therefore, the same operation can be carried out for equations (2), and we obtain the system:

$$\dot{q}_j^i = q_j^i \left( (f_j^i - \bar{f}^i) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - (d_j^i - \bar{d}^i) \right) \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( (\bar{f}_j - \bar{f}) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - (\bar{d}_j - \bar{d}) \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{n} = n([\bar{f} + \Phi] \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \bar{d} + \Psi), \quad (6)$$

where  $f_j^i$  and  $d_j^i$  are the fertility and mortality, respectively, of the  $j$ -th strategy in the  $i$ -th subpopulation,  $\bar{f}_j = \sum_{i=1}^w q_j^i f_j^i$  and  $\bar{d}_j = \sum_{i=1}^w q_j^i d_j^i$  are the mean fertility and mortality, respectively, in the  $j$ -th subpopulation and  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{d}$  are the respective values in the global population.

## 1.2 The classical approach to the modelling of age structured populations

Now we focus on age structured models (age classes will be indexed by superscripts). The classical approach to the modelling of age structured populations is related to Bernadelli-Lewis-Leslie matrices (Bernadelli 1941, Lewis 1942, Leslie 1945, Charlesworth 1994, Caswell 2001), following the matrix equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} n^0 \\ n^1 \\ \dots \\ n^m \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} f^0 & f^1 & \dots & f^m \\ s^0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s^{m-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n^0 \\ n^1 \\ \dots \\ n^m \end{bmatrix}_t, \quad (7)$$

where there are  $m + 1$  age classes,  $n^i$  is the size of the  $i$ th age class and  $f^i$  is fertility and  $s^i$  is survival, respectively, in the  $i$ th age class. Thus  $n^0(t+1) = \sum_i n^i(t) f^i$  and the transition between subsequent age classes is  $n^i(t+1) = s^{i-1} n^{i-1}(t)$ . When the time unit equals time step between age classes the above system is a good model of age structure. This age-structured growth model suggests a steady-state, or stable, age-structure and growth rate. The growth rate can be calculated from the characteristic polynomial of the Bernadelli-Lewis-Leslie Matrix called the Euler-Lotka equation:

$$f^0 + \sum_{i=1}^m e^{-ir} f^i \prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s^z = 1, \quad (8)$$

where  $r$  is the intrinsic growth rate of the population and  $\prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s^z$  describes survival to age  $i$ . We note here that in reality  $r$  will not be an independent parameter, and moreover will change in time as the distributions of the sizes of age classes change. An equilibrium distribution over the age classes in turn will allow us to define  $r$  in terms of the other model parameters. Simple ODE generalization of this system with continuous time but discrete age structure can be obtained by application of the delayed differential equations (Caswell 2001) where survival rates may describe aggregated exponential survival between respective age classes (Diekmann et al 2017). However this approach may not work if the mortality function depends on the actual population state (as in game theory). In those cases the mortality rate may be unknown since it will depend on the trajectory of the dynamics during the age class. Then we can consider continuous time limit of infinite number of infinitely small age classes where population structure becomes function  $n(t, l)$  of time  $t$  and continuous age  $l$  describing moment of lifetime of individual. Then we can imagine the Taylor expansion analogous to the transition equation describing



---

small time step  $dt$  leading to ageing  $da$

$$n(t+dt, l+dl) = n(t, l) + \frac{\delta n}{\delta t} dt + \frac{\delta n}{\delta l} dl = s(l)n(t, l) = (1 - \tau d(l)dt) n(t, l), \quad (9)$$

where  $\tau d(l)$  is the continuous time mortality rate similarly to the game models but without distinction between the focal game and the background interactions. Since  $dl = dt$  we obtain the McKendrick von Foerster equation

$$\frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta l} = -\tau d(l)n(t, l), \quad (10)$$

which should be completed by boundary conditions  $n(t, 0) = \int_0^\infty n(t, l)\tau f(l)dl$  and initial age distribution  $n(0, l)$ .

## 2 The paper structure

In this paper we will derive the discretization of the McKendrick von Foerster model allowing for derivation of frequency dependent models. Then we will use it to build two approaches to modelling selection among competing strategies with life cycle in asexual population. One approach will be focused on impact of age structures of strategies on selection, while the second will show impact of selection dynamics on the age structure of the whole population. Obtained models will be generalized to the mixed PDE-ODE models with continuous non-discretized age structures. Derived framework will be illustrated by sex ratio example combining two approaches together, which will allow to model the sexually reproducing population.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 When can the McKendrick von Foerster model be presented as a system of ODE's?

In this section we will build the submodel describing the dynamics of the age structure of a subpopulation of carriers of some strategy competing with other strategies. Demographic vital rates will be outcomes of interactions between carriers of different strategies, interpreted as rounds of evolutionary games as in Argasinski and Broom (2018a). Thus as in replicator dynamics models we have the state of the population described by strategy frequencies  $q_j$  but for each strategy subpopulation we have a respective age structure  $a_j^i$ . Demographic payoffs determining the vital rates will depend not only on the age frequencies  $q$  as in the classical replicator models but also on age of the opponent, thus the set of the vectors of age structures for all strategies  $a$  should be another argument of payoff functions. A major technical difference between the McKendrick von Foerster model and replicator dynamics is the fact that the first is a PDE (or system of PDE's as for example in Rudnicki and Mackey, 1993) and the second is a system of ODE's. The simple combination of both approaches will lead to a mathematically elegant but technically intractable system due to actual lack of general theory for mixed PDE-ODE systems and software for numerical computation. This methodology should be developed in the future, however before that, we need useful approach based on existing solutions. To solve this problem we can approximate the continuous system by a large number of ODE's describing unit interval age classes consisting of all individuals of age from  $a$  to  $a + 1$ . Since we want to model frequency dependent selection, the mortality and fertility payoffs will depend on the trajectory of the population state. Therefore we cannot use

simplified delayed differential equations since we do not know the trajectories during the time delay interval. Instead we can assume that the unit of a timescale described by interaction rate  $\tau$  is short enough that the changes of the population state are small enough with respect to the size of the population (such as 50 births in a population of 30000), that the resulting changes of frequency dependent birth and death rates will be negligible. Note that, even locally linear increments of the numbers of different strategy numbers, may result in nonlinear changes of their frequencies. Following Appendix A we see that equation (10) can be discretized and approximated by the replicator dynamics. In particular for the  $j$ th competing strategy we describe the system in frequencies  $a_j^i = n_j^i / \sum_{z=0}^m n_j^z$  and a scaling parameter  $n$ . Assume that  $r_i(t) = f_j^i(q(t), a(t)) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - d_j^i(q(t), a(t))$  and  $r(t)$  is the respective averaged value. If the growth rates  $\tau r_i(t)$  are nearly constant, then for the chosen timescale described by interaction rate  $\tau$  changes of the strategy frequencies during single time unit are  $\Delta q_i = \frac{\tau}{(1 + \tau r(t))} q_i(t) (r_i(t) - r(t))$ , thus they are sublinear. Therefore,  $\tau$  should be as big as possible to minimize number of equations, but small enough that the resulting changes of the arguments of the payoff functions  $\Delta q_i$  (and similarly others) should change their values only slightly (that  $\Delta f = f_j^i(q(t) + \Delta q) - f_j^i(q(t))$  and  $\Delta d = d_j^i(q(t) + \Delta q) - d_j^i(q(t))$  are small enough, but not necessarily infinitesimal), that the resulting changes of the vital rates  $\tau \Delta f$  and  $\tau \Delta d$  are negligible. Then the discretization is acceptable and we obtain the following system:

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1}(q, a) - a_j^i (r_j(q, a, n) + 1) \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{n}_j = n_j r_j(q, a, n), \quad (12)$$

where  $a_0 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  and the Malthusian parameter describing the growth of the  $j$ th strategy is

$$r_j(q, a, n) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i \left( f_j^i(q, a) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + s_j^i(q, a) \right) - 1. \quad (13)$$

Important thing is that age class survival  $s_j(q, a) = (1 - \tau d_j(q, a))$  describes aggregated outcomes of the game rounds occurring during time unit. therefore it is distinct from the survival of a single round  $1 - d_j(q, a)$  which should be used in trade-off functions (Argasinski and Broom 2012,2017a,2018) when only survivors of the game round can reproduce leading to fertility  $(1 - d_j(q, a))f_j$ . In addition, due to nearly linear behaviour within single time unit the system (11,12) is equivalent to the large Leslie matrix (7) with survival  $s(q, a) = (1 - \tau d(q, a))$  and then parameter  $\tau$  describes the fraction of individuals that played single game round. For system (11) the following attracting nullcline manifold exists (for constant mortalities  $s_i$  this is attracting steady state):

$$\hat{a}_j^i = \frac{\hat{a}_j^0 \prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_j^z(q, a)}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i} = \frac{\hat{a}_j^0 \prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_j^z(q, a)}{\left( \sum_{z=0}^m \hat{a}_j^z (f_j^z(q, a) + s_j^z(q, a)) \right)^i}. \quad (14)$$

Note that  $\hat{a}_0$  will satisfy the general form for  $\hat{a}_i$  in equation 14. In addition the Euler-Lotka equation is satisfied (for a derivation and proof, see Appendix B). Now we can derive submodel for derivation of the full model describing the dynamics of all strategies.

FIGURE 1 HERE

### 3.2 The extension to multipopulation replicator dynamics

Now we can incorporate the above model into a multipopulation evolutionary game (Argasinski 2006). Recall that we have  $w$  strategies and  $m+1$  age classes

indexed from 0 to  $m$ . Assume that  $p$  describes the strategy (phenotype) fraction and  $a$  describes the size of the age class. As before,  $f_j^i$  and  $s_j^i$  describe, respectively, the fertility and survival of the  $j$ -strategist in age class  $i$ . Two perspectives are possible (see Fig. 1):

a) The first problem we consider is the impact of the age structure in subpopulations strategically homogenous on selection of the strategies, denoted as system  $S_a$ . It can be described by coordinates:

$$a_j^0, \dots, a_j^m \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, w \quad \text{the age structure of the } j\text{-strategists where}$$

$$a_j^i = n_j^i / \sum_i n_j^i,$$

$$p_1, \dots, p_w \quad \text{the strategy frequencies in the whole population where}$$

$$p_i = \sum_j n_j^i / n.$$

b) The second problem is focused on how strategic selection within each age class affects the age structure of the overall population, denoted as system  $S_b$ . It can be described by coordinates:

$$p_1^i, \dots, p_w^i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m \quad \text{strategy frequencies in age class } i \text{ where}$$

$$p_j^i = n_j^i / \sum_j n_j^i,$$

$$a^1, \dots, a^m \quad \text{the age structure of the population where } a^i = \sum_j n_j^i / n$$

Thus in both cases we will have a core system describing the whole population (strategic composition in  $S_a$  and age structure in  $S_b$ ) completed by the respective subsystems describing the age structure of the subpopulation of carriers for each strategy (for  $S_a$ ) or the strategic composition of each age class (for  $S_b$ ).

FIGURE 2 HERE

Now we describe the transition of coordinates between both formulations. First we should define the auxiliary canonical coordinates without division into subclasses:

$$q_j^i = a^i p_j^i = p_j a_j^i. \quad (15)$$

Now according to Argasinski (2006) we can define transitions between the two systems:

$S_a$  to  $S_b$ :

$$p^i = [p_1^i, \dots, p_w^i] = \left[ \frac{a_1^i p_1}{\sum_{j=1}^w a_j^i p_j}, \dots, \frac{a_w^i p_w}{\sum_{j=1}^w a_j^i p_j} \right], \quad (16)$$

$$a = [a^1, \dots, a^m] = \left[ \sum_{j=1}^w a_j^0 p_j, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^w a_j^m p_j \right], \quad (17)$$

and  $S_b$  to  $S_a$ :

$$a_j = [a_j^1, \dots, a_j^m] = \left[ \frac{a_j^0 p_j^0}{\sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i p_j^i}, \dots, \frac{a_j^m p_j^m}{\sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i p_j^i} \right], \quad (18)$$

$$p = [p_1, \dots, p_w] = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_1^i, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_w^i \right]. \quad (19)$$

Now let us derive systems of equations operating in both coordinate systems. In the following we use the within group averaging terms:

$$\bar{f}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i, \quad \bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i, \quad \bar{s}^i = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i s_j^i, \quad \bar{f}^i = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i.$$

We also use two global averages, which can each be written in two ways:

$$\bar{f} = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \bar{f}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \bar{f}^i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{s} = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \bar{s}^i.$$

For system  $S_a$  we have the following system of differential equations (see Appendix C for detailed derivation):

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left( \bar{f}_j \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s}_j \right) \quad (20)$$

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( (\bar{f}_j - \bar{f}) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right) \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} - 1 \right), \quad (22)$$

giving

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left( \sum_{z=0}^m a_j^z f_j^z \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{z=0}^m a_j^z s_j^z \right), \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i f_z^i \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i s_z^i \right) \right), \quad (24)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i - 1 \right). \quad (25)$$

For system  $S_b$  we have (see Appendix D for a detailed derivation):

$$\dot{p}_j^0 = \frac{1}{a^0} \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i - p_j^0 \bar{f} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right), \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{p}_j^i = \frac{a^{i-1}}{a^i} \left( p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - p_j^i \bar{s}^{i-1} \right), \quad (27)$$

$$\dot{a}^i = a^{i-1} \bar{s}^{i-1} - a^i \left( \bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} \right), \quad (28)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} - 1 \right). \quad (29)$$

The expanded form of the above system will be

$$\dot{p}_j^0 = \frac{1}{a^0} \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i - p_j^0 \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^i f_z^i \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right), \quad (30)$$

$$\dot{p}_j^i = \frac{a^{i-1}}{a^i} \left( p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - p_j^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^{i-1} s_z^{i-1} \right), \quad (31)$$

$$\dot{a}^i = a^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a^i \sum_{z=0}^m a^z \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z f_j^z \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z s_j^z \right), \quad (32)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i s_j^i \right) - 1 \right) \quad (33)$$

and equation (33) on  $n$  is equivalent to (22). In both cases the equilibrium population size is

$$1 - \frac{n}{K} = \frac{1 - \bar{s}}{\bar{f}} \Rightarrow n = K \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \bar{s}}{\bar{f}} \right). \quad (34)$$

### 3.3 Mixed PDE-ODE versions of systems $S_a$ and $S_b$

We can derive mixed PDE-ODE versions of systems  $S_a$  and  $S_b$ , where age profile is the continuous function, which are simpler and more mathematically elegant. The advantage is that they are independent of the timescale since interaction rate  $\tau$  will cancel out (see Appendix E for derivations). In addition the distinction between aggregated age class survival and game round survival discussed below equation (13) is not necessary since PDE versions of both systems will be driven by game theoretic payoffs only. Therefore for system  $S_a$  we have

$$\frac{\delta a_j(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta a_j(t, l)}{\delta l} = a_j(t, l) \left[ -d_j(t, l) - (\bar{f}_j \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \bar{d}_j) \right] \quad (35)$$

$$\dot{p}_j(t) = p_j(t) \left( (\bar{f}_j(t) - \bar{f}(t)) \left( 1 - \frac{n(t)}{K} \right) - (\bar{d}_j(t) - \bar{d}(t)) \right) \quad (36)$$

$$\dot{n}(t) = n(t) (\bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \bar{d}) \quad (37)$$

and  $a_j(t, 0) = \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) \int_0^\infty a_j(t, l) f(l) dl$ . For system  $S_b$  we have

$$\frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta l} = p_j(t, l) [\bar{d}(t, l) - d(l)] \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta l} = a(t, l) \left[ -d(l) - (\bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \bar{d}) \right] \quad (39)$$

$$\dot{n}(t) = n(t) (\bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \bar{d}) \quad (40)$$



and  $a_j(t, 0) = (1 - \frac{n}{K}) \int_0^\infty a_j(t, l) f(l) dl$  and  $p_j(t, 0) = (1 - \frac{n}{K}) \int_0^\infty p_j(t, l) f(l) dl$ .

In all averaged values sums are replaced by respective integrals.

### 3.4 A sex ratio example

In this section we will show how the methods presented in the previous sections can be used to extend the simpler age independent model to the age dependent case. We will show this methodology by example of the synthetic sex ratio model (Argasinski 2012, Argasinski 2013, Argasinski 2017) combining simple explicit genetics (similar to the more advanced approaches as in Karlin and Lessard 1986) with rigorous strategic analysis. We will use the second formulation of the model focused on selection of genes encoding sex ratio strategies (Argasinski 2013), since extension to the age structure of the first version of the model will be extremely complicated. Below we outline the basic details of this model. Introduction of the life cycle perspective to theoretical studies on sex ration is important from the point of view of the collected data showing huge impact of age specific mortalities on the dynamics of age specific sex ratios (for example see Orzack et al. 2015 for the data showing the changes of the human sex ratio from conception to death).

We have a population consisting of  $x$  females and  $y$  males. All of them are carriers of a single gene encoding one from a finite number  $w$  of competing sex ratio strategies (strategy  $P_j \in [0, 1]$  is carried by  $x_j$  females and  $y_j$  males) which are expressed by females. Then the population state can be expressed by the population's sex ratio  $P = y/(x + y)$ , primary sex ratio (average strategy of females)  $\bar{P}_{pr} = \sum_{j=1}^w \frac{x_j}{x} P_j$  and vectors  $G$  and  $M$  where:

$$G_j = \frac{x_j + y_j}{\sum_{z=1}^w (x_z + y_z)} \quad \text{the gene frequencies,}$$

$$M_j = \frac{y_j}{x_j + y_j} \quad \text{sex ratios in the carrier subpopulations.}$$

Then  $P = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j M_j$  and  $\bar{P}_{pr} = \sum_{j=1}^w \frac{x_j}{x} P_j = \sum_{j=1}^w \frac{G_j(1-M_j)}{1-P} P_j$ .

Payoffs of male and female carriers and the average gene carrier are:

$$f_m(P_j, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{x}{y} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{x_j}{y_j} P_j \right) \quad (41)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{1-P}{P} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{(1-M_j)}{M_j} P_j \right), \quad (42)$$

$$f_f(P_j, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( (1-P_j) + \frac{y_j}{x_j} (1-\bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{x}{y} \right) \quad (43)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left( (1-P_j) + \frac{M_j}{(1-M_j)} (1-\bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{1-P}{P} \right), \quad (44)$$

$$f_G(P_j, G, M) = M_j f_m(P_j, G, M) + (1-M_j) f_f(P_j, G, M) \quad (45)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left[ M_j \frac{1-P}{P} + (1-M_j) \right] \quad (46)$$

where  $k$  is the number of offspring per female. The respective average payoffs are:

$$\bar{f}_m(G, M) = k \frac{1-P}{P} \bar{P}_{pr}, \quad (47)$$

$$\bar{f}(G, M) = k(1-P). \quad (48)$$

In effect we obtain the system describing the dynamics of gene frequencies and the sex ratios in the carrier subpopulations:

$$\dot{G}_j = G_j (f_g(P_j, G, M) - \bar{f}(G, M)), \quad (49)$$

$$\dot{M}_j = M_j (f_m(P_j, G, M) - f_g(P_j, G, M)), \quad (50)$$

leading to the following system of equations

$$\dot{G}_j = G_j \left( \frac{1}{2} - P \right) \left( \frac{M_j}{P} - 1 \right), \quad (51)$$

$$\dot{M}_j = \frac{k}{2} \left( M_j \left( \frac{1-P}{P} \right) (\bar{P}_{pr} - M_j) + (1-M_j) (P_j - M_j) \right). \quad (52)$$

The above system can be regarded as an example of multi-level selection since the fate of a gene is determined by the actual composition of the carrier subpopulation described by the carriers' sex ratio  $M_j$  and the threshold between growth and decline is the adult sex ratio  $P = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j M_j$ . The parameters  $M_j$  are determined by the Tug of War dynamics (52) describing the impact of female carriers producing newborns according to the carried strategy  $P_j$  and randomly drawn female partners of male carriers producing newborns according to the average strategy of females  $\bar{P}_{pr}$ .

### 3.5 The extension of the sex ratio model to the age structured case

We will extend this system in the following way.

FIGURE 3 HERE

System a) will be applied to extend the gene pool dynamics to the system with explicit age structure for each subpopulation of carriers (described by  $a_j^i$  for the  $j$ -th gene) of the particular gene. This means that each equation (51) will be transformed to the form (21) and completed by the respective subsystem (20) describing the age structure of the subpopulation of carriers of the particular gene. In addition for the age structure of each strategy we will apply system b) to describe the dynamics of the sex ratios within each age class. Thus for each strategy, the respective subsystem (20) will be the core subsystem (32) of system  $S_b$ , and it will be completed by the respective subsystems (30,31), describing the dynamics of strategy carriers' sex ratios in particular age classes. This structure will be the generalization of the  $M_j$  equations (52) in the original model. Assume that survival, described by  $s_f^i$  for females and by  $s_m^i$  for males, depends only on sex and age. Males are active in the age classes from  $a$  to  $b$  and females from  $c$  to  $d$ , and fractions of sexually

active female and male individuals carrying the  $i$ th strategy are

$$S_j^f = \sum_{z=c}^d a_j^z (1 - M_j^z), \quad S_j^m = \sum_{z=a}^b a_j^z M_j^z. \quad (53)$$

Analogous parameters for the whole population are

$$\bar{S}^f = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j S_j^f, \quad \bar{S}^m = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j S_j^m. \quad (54)$$

In addition we will have  $P = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j \sum_i a_j^i M_j^i$ , and the primary sex ratio (average strategy of active females) will be:

$$\bar{P}_{pr} = \sum_{j=1}^w \frac{G_j S_j^f}{\sum_z G_z S_z^f} P_j = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^w G_j S_j^f P_j}{\bar{S}^f}. \quad (55)$$

The operational sex ratio among carriers of strategy  $j$  and the average operational sex ratio in the whole population will be

$$M_j^{op} = \frac{S_j^m}{S_j^m + S_j^f}, \quad P_{op} = \frac{\bar{S}^m}{\bar{S}^m + \bar{S}^f}, \quad (56)$$

The equations on  $G$  should be updated according to the additional assumptions on age limits of sexual activity (age classes from  $a$  to  $b$  for males and  $c$  to  $d$  for females). We should also derive the respective forms of per capita fertility payoffs described in the new coordinates. For derivation of the dynamics we need the following operational male fertility payoff, average per capita gene fertility payoff and average fertility in the whole population (the detailed derivation is in Appendix F):

$$f_m^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{1 - M_i^{op}}{M_i^{op}} P_j \right), \quad (57)$$

$$f_g(P_j, a, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right), \quad (58)$$

$$\bar{f}(a, G, M) = k \bar{S}^f. \quad (59)$$

Note that  $(1 - P_{op}) / P_{op}$  describes the number of partners and  $(1 - M_j^{op}) / M_j^{op}$  the number of female carriers ("sisters") of the average male carrier of the focal strategy gene. Therefore, the male operational fertility payoff  $f_m^{op}$  describes the fertility of partners with the average strategy and "sisters" carrying the same gene. The gene payoff  $f_g$  describes the aggregated fertility of all female carriers and all partners of male carriers. Thus we will obtain the following general system derived in Appendix G:

$$\dot{G}_j = G_j \left( (f_g(P_j, a, G, M) - \bar{f}(a, G, M)) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right), \quad (60)$$

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} \bar{s}_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left[ f_g(P_j, a, G, M) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \bar{s}_j \right], \quad (61)$$

$$\dot{M}_j^0 = \frac{(f_m^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) S_j^m - M_j^0 f_g(P_j, a, G, M))}{a_j^0} \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right), \quad (62)$$

$$\dot{M}_j^i = \frac{a_j^{i-1}}{a_j^i} (M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1} - M_j^i \bar{s}_j^{i-1}), \quad (63)$$

$$n = n \left( \bar{f} \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \bar{s} - 1 \right), \quad (64)$$

where  $\bar{s}_j^i = M_j^i s_m^i + (1 - M_j^i) s_f^i$  describes the average survival of the carrier of the  $j$ th strategy determined by the actual carriers sex ratio. Then  $\bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i \bar{s}_j^i$  and  $\bar{s} = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j \bar{s}_j$ .

Thus the general equations (20-22) have become equations (60,61,64) through the sequences; (21)  $\rightarrow$  (49)  $\rightarrow$  (60), (20)  $\rightarrow$  (32)  $\rightarrow$  (61), (30)  $\rightarrow$  (62), (31)  $\rightarrow$  (63). Figure 2 shows how the phase space of the original model was extended to the age structured case. After substitution of the payoff functions (see Appendix G for calculations) we obtain the system of equations:

$$\dot{G}_j = G_j \left( k \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{S_j^f}{\bar{S}^f} + \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \right) - 1 \right] \bar{S}^f \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right), \quad (65)$$

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} \bar{s}_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left[ \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s}_j \right], \quad (66)$$

$$\dot{M}_j^0 = \frac{k}{2a_j^0} \left( S_j^m (\bar{P}_{pr} - M_i^0) \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} + S_j^f (P_j - M_i^0) \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right), \quad (67)$$

$$\dot{M}_j^i = \frac{a_j^{i-1}}{a_j^i} (M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1} - M_j^i \bar{s}_j^{i-1}), \quad (68)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left[ k \bar{S}^f \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} - 1 \right], \quad (69)$$

where average survivals are

$$\bar{s}_j^i = M_j^i s_m^i + (1 - M_j^i) s_f^i, \quad \bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=1}^m a^i \bar{s}_j^i. \quad (70)$$

$$S_j^f = \sum_{z=c}^d a_j^z (1 - M_j^z), \quad S_j^m = \sum_{z=a}^b a_j^z M_j^z. \quad (71)$$

are the fractions of sexually active females and males among the  $P_j$  gene carriers;

$$\bar{S}^f = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j \sum_{z=c}^d a_j^z (1 - M_j^z), \quad \bar{S}^m = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j \sum_{z=a}^b a_j^z M_j^z \quad (72)$$

are the respective averages. Thus the selection mechanism is seriously altered by the age structure. The above system shows that differences in mortality between sexes and different ages of sexual activity can significantly affect the selection of individual strategies. Equations (67) contain the terms  $S_j^m$  and  $S_j^f$  describing the fractions of sexually active individuals and are the equivalent of the Tug of War dynamics (52). The dynamics of the age structure of each

strategy is attracted by

$$\hat{a}_j^i = \hat{a}_j^{i-1} \frac{M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1} + (1 - M_j^{i-1}) s_f^{i-1}}{k \bar{S}^f \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \bar{s}}. \quad (73)$$

Sex ratios in carrier subpopulations converge to

$$\hat{M}_j^0 = \frac{\bar{P}_{pr} \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \bar{S}^f + S_j^f P_j}{\frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \bar{S}^f + S_j^f}, \quad (74)$$

$$\hat{M}_j^i = \frac{M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1}}{\bar{s}_j^{i-1}}. \quad (75)$$

Note that when we assume that there are no differences in survival probabilities between sexes ( $s_f^i = s_m^i$ ) then the system (65-69) reduces to the simplified version. Equations (66) will be independent of parameters  $M_j^i$  and the equations (68) will converge to the constant value over the whole life cycle ( $M_j^i = M_j^0$  for all  $i$ ). Therefore all strategies will have the same age structure. In effect the bracketed term ( $\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}$ ) describing the excess of the mortality payoff from average mortality, will vanish in equations (65) and selection of the genes will be driven by the excess fertility payoff bracket ( $f_g(P_j, a, G, M) - \bar{f}(a, G, M)$ ) describing the Fisherian mechanism driven by the difference in reproductive value between the sexes

$$(f_g(P_j, a, G, M) - \bar{f}(a, G, M)) = k \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{S_j^f}{\bar{S}^f} + \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \right) - 1 \right] \bar{S}^f, \quad (76)$$

which is equivalent to the Shaw-Mohler formula (Shaw and Mohler 1953).

If we assume that both sexes are mature in the same age classes then  $S_j^f = 1 - S_j^m$ , we have that operational sex ratios are  $M_j^{op} = S_j^m$  and  $P_{op} = \bar{S}^m$  ( $\bar{S}^f = 1 - P_{op}$ ). Therefore for the operational sex ratio  $P_{op} = 0.5$  the above formula equals zero for all strategies. When we additionally assume that the sex specific mortalities for different ages are the same, the system replicates the

results of the original model. In the general case if  $S_j^f = \bar{S}^f$  and  $S_j^m = \bar{S}^m$  then obviously operational sex ratios (56) are equal. In other cases, the strategies with greater fraction of sex which is in minority among active individuals, which can be described by operational sex ratio  $P_{op}$ . Since all individuals of the same sex suffered the same mortality, then the values of parameters  $S_j^f$  and  $S_j^m$  are determined by allocation of sexes at birth, determined by encoded strategy. Due to constant brood size  $k$ , if every offspring can be allocated to male or female pool and increase of female newborns lead to decrease of male newborns and vice versa. Therefore, this allocation will determine operational sex ratios among active individuals and selection should act accordingly to differences in operational sex ratios, similarly to (51). We can see this on Fig. 4 depicting numerical simulation for the case of three competing strategies  $P_1 = 0.05$ ,  $P_2 = 0.55$ ,  $P_3 = 0.95$  with 25 age classes plus infant age class 0. For simplicity of the illustrative example we assumed that age class survivals will be the same with only one change in some arbitrary ages, different for males and females. For female we have survival 0.95 till age 10 and 0.80 in subsequent ages. For males we have 0.88 till age 15 and then 0.72 respectively. By definition survivals in last age classes are zero. Females are fertile from age  $c = 8$  till age  $d = 15$  while males are active from age  $a = 8$  till age  $b = 20$ . The initial population size was  $n(0) = 40$  with a carrying capacity  $K = 10000$ . Initial conditions are  $G_1(0) = 0.9$  and  $G_2(0) = G_3(0) = 0.05$  and  $M_1^0 = 0.7$  and  $M_2^0 = M_3^0 = 0.1$ . We start from the very young population where adult age classes have frequencies 0.001 leading to 0.025 proportion of non-infant individuals and sex ratios are  $M_1^i = 0.9$  and  $M_2^i = M_3^i = 0.8$ . These exaggerated conditions show the initial dynamics of the growing cohort leading to the interesting patterns depicted on Fig. 5 depicting the age structure and Fig 6 showing the dynamics of age specific sex ratios. Fig. 7 shows the delayed convergence to the respective Euler-Lotka manifolds. At the global equilibrium excess fertility



---

payoffs (76) (the difference between the payoff and the mean) are not equal to zero because they must balance the nonzero values of the excess mortality payoffs for growth rates to be equal (Fig.8). Therefore, the classical Fisherian equilibrium focused only on fertility payoffs is not reached here. A question arises about the interplay between fertility and mortality and how it leads to the primary sex ratio of 0.5. In addition the operational sex ratio is far from 0.5. Therefore in this case the Fisherian mechanism is not enough to explain the origins of the primary sex ratio of 0.5. Fig. 3 shows that the mechanism driven by the operational sex ratios still works but all values are rescaled, and we also have different mortalities for different strategies. The interplay between the Fisherian mechanism, driven by fertility and differences in reproductive value between the sexes, and age structure, driven by survival differences between the sexes, needs an explanation which will be the subject of future work.

FIGURES 4-8 HERE

#### 4 Discussion

In this work we presented a new modelling framework combining evolutionary dynamics with demographic structure. This approach can be a useful tool in the development of the synthesis between evolutionary game theory and life history theory. We started with the derivation of the ODE discretized approximation of the McKendrick von Foerster model of age structured populations and its critical manifold equivalent to the Euler-Lotka equation. Then the obtained model was extended to the explicit case of multiple competing strategies and transformed into two types of age structured replicator dynamics. The first type is focused on the selection of strategies when each strategy is described by a respective subsystem describing the dynamics of age structure.

The second type is focused on the age structure of the whole population and in each age class the dynamics of strategic composition is described by the respective subsystem. Obtained two formulations of the model lead to huge ODE systems which are equivalent to systems of huge Bernadelli-Lewis-Leslie matrices. Another complication is that for the discretized age structure we need age class survival function which will describe the aggregated outcomes of all interactions (game rounds) that happened during single time unit. This survival function is distinct from the game round survival which can be used for derivation of fertility-mortality tradeoff functions used in situations when only survivors of the interaction can reproduce (Argasinski and Broom 2012, 2018a, 2018b). Free from these disadvantages are mixed PDE-ODE versions of both models presented later. They consist of a smaller number of equations and depend on the pure game theoretic payoffs only (additional survival functions are not necessary). In addition this approach is timescale independent since interaction rate cancels out. Therefore it is more mathematically elegant. The development of the theory and software for mixed PDE-ODE systems will make this approach useful.

Both approaches are combined together in the illustrative example of a sex ratio model. This is an extension of the dynamic sex ratio model (Argasinski 2012, 2013, 2017). It shows that when we assume different mortalities for both sexes; the classical Fisherian explanation based on the differences of reproductive value of offspring is not enough to explain convergence to the primary sex ratio of 0.5. The excess fertility payoff does not converge to 0 which would be equivalent to equal reproductive values of both sexes, but its non-zero value is equal to the value of the excess mortality payoff. The question how this mechanism works in detail should be explained in future research. New model provides the theoretical framework that can be used for explanation of the

---

mechanisms shaping the patterns observable in collected data on age specific sex ratios from conception to death such as Orzack et al. (2015).

The obtained results clearly show that a life cycle perspective plays a crucial role in evolutionary processes. In the classical approaches to evolutionary game theory individuals cannot change their properties during the lifetime. Thus their life history is a memoryless process, and survival of a single interaction does not change the state of the individual. This is caused by the fact that the classical approaches to evolutionary games are focused on the strategies interpreted as patterns of behaviour, not on the individual itself. The exception to this rule is the state based approach (Houston McNamara 1999). The explicit description of the life cycle and the different payoffs at different ages leads to a more complicated game theoretic structure. Especially mixed PDE-ODE approach will lead to more complex payoff functions based on continuous distributions of ages for different strategies. This will need more sophisticated methods such as models with function valued traits (Oechssler and Riedel 2001, Dieckmann et al 2006, van Veelen and Spreij 2009), state based games (Houston and McNamara 1991, 1999) or "large games" with a distinction between strategy sets and population states (Wieczorek and Wiszniewska 1998, Wieczorek 2004; 2005), than to basic two person matrix games. The modelling framework proposed in this paper can be a useful tool in the research on animal personalities (Dall et al. 2004, Wolf et al. 2007, Wolf and Weissing 2010, Wolf and Weissing 2012, Wolf and McNamara 2012). The combination of game theoretic analysis with an explicit age structure will allow us to analyze the relationships between behavioural strategies (such as aggression or cowardice) and life history traits (such as allocation of energy into growth or reproduction). This is important because the life history trade-offs are shaped by external mortality which are the outcome of interactions with the environment. On the other hand the demographic outcomes of interactions such

as mortality are affected by phenotypic traits such as growth shaped by life history strategies. This constitutes life-history-behavioural feedback.

## References

1. Argasinski K (2006) Dynamic multipopulation and density dependent evolutionary games related to replicator dynamics. A metasimplex concept. *Math Biosci* 202, 88–114.
2. Argasinski K (2012) The dynamics of sex ratio evolution Dynamics of global population parameters. *J Theor Biol*, 309, 134-146.
3. Argasinski K (2013) The Dynamics of Sex Ratio Evolution: From the Gene Perspective to Multilevel Selection. *PLoS one*, 8(4), e60405.
4. Argasinski K (2017) The dynamics of sex ratio evolution: the impact of males as passive gene carriers on multilevel selection. *Dyn Games Appl*, 1-25.
5. Argasinski K, Broom M (2018a) Interaction rates, vital rates, background fitness and replicator dynamics: how to embed evolutionary game structure into realistic population dynamics. *Theory Biosci*, 1-18.
6. Argasinski K, Broom M (2018b) Evolutionary stability under limited population growth: Eco-evolutionary feedbacks and replicator dynamics. *Ecol Complexity* 34, 198-212
7. Argasinski K, Broom M (2012) Ecological theatre and the evolutionary game: how environmental and demographic factors determine payoffs in evolutionary games. *J Math Biol*, 67(4), 935-962.
8. Bernadelli, H., 1941, Population waves. *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, 31, 1–18.
9. Caswell H (2001) *Matrix population models: Construction, Analysis and Interpretation*. Sinauer
10. Charlesworth, B. (1994). *Evolution in age-structured populations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Cressman R (1992) *The Stability Concept of Evolutionary Game Theory*. Springer
12. Cressman R, Garay J (2004) Stability in N-Species Coevolutionary Systems. *Theor Pop Biol*, 64, 519–533
13. Dall SR, Houston AI, McNamara JM (2004) The behavioural ecology of personality: consistent individual differences from an adaptive perspective. *Ecol Lett*, 7(8), 734-739.
14. Dieckmann, U., Heino, M., & Parvinen, K. (2006). The adaptive dynamics of function-valued traits. *Journal of theoretical Biology*, 241(2), 370-389.

- 
15. Diekmann, O., Gyllenberg, M. & Metz, J.A.J. (2020a) Finite dimensional state representation of physiologically structured populations. *J. Math. Biol.* 80, 205–273
  16. Diekmann, O., Gyllenberg, M. & Metz, J.A.J. (2020b) On models of physiologically structured populations and their reduction to ordinary differential equations. *J. Math. Biol.* 80, 189–204
  17. Doebeli M, Ispolatov Y, Simon B, (2017) Point of view: Towards a mechanistic foundation of evolutionary theory. *Elife*, 6, e23804.
  18. Garay J, Varga Z, Gámez M Cabello T, (2016) Sib cannibalism can be adaptive for kin. *Ecol Modell*, 334, pp.51-59.
  19. Geritz SAH, Kisdi E (2011) Mathematical ecology: why mechanistic models? *J Math Biol* DOI 10.1007/s00285-011-0496-3
  20. Diekmann O, Gyllenberg M, Metz JAJ, (2017) Finite dimensional state representation of linear and nonlinear delay systems. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 1-29.
  21. Hofbauer J, Sigmund K (1988) *The Theory of Evolution and Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge University Press
  22. Hofbauer J, Sigmund K (1998) *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press
  23. Hougaard P (1984) Life table methods for heterogeneous populations: distributions describing the heterogeneity. *Biometrika*, 71(1), 75-83.
  24. Houston A, McNamara J (1999) *Models of adaptive behaviour*. Cambridge University Press.
  25. Houston A, McNamara J (1991) Evolutionarily stable strategies in the repeated hawk-dove game. *Behav Ecol* 2 (3), 219-227.
  26. Hui C (2006) Carrying capacity, population equilibrium, and environment's maximal load. *Ecol Modell* 192, 1–2, 317–320
  27. Karlin, S., & Lessard, S. (1986). *Theoretical studies on sex ratio evolution (Vol. 22)*. Princeton University Press.
  28. Leslie PH, (1945) The use of matrices in certain population mathematics. *Biometrika*, 33, 183–212.
  29. Lessard, S., & Soares, C. D. (2018) Frequency-dependent growth in class-structured populations: continuous dynamics in the limit of weak selection. *J Math Biol.*, 1-31.
  30. Lewis, P.H., (1942), On the generation and growth of a population. *Sankhya*, 6, 93–96.
  31. Li XY, Giaimo S, Baudisch A, Traulsen A (2015) Modeling evolutionary games in populations with demographic structure. *J Theor Biol*, 380, 506-515.

- 
32. Maynard Smith J (1982) *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge University Press
  33. McKendrick A G Application of mathematics to medical problems, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* 14 (1926) 98-130
  34. McNamara, J (2013). Towards a richer evolutionary game theory. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 10(88), 20130544..
  35. Oechssler, J., & Riedel, F. (2001). Evolutionary dynamics on infinite strategy spaces. *Economic Theory*, 17(1), 141-162.
  36. Orzack, S. H., Stubblefield, J. W., Akmaev, V. R., Colls, P., Munné, S., Scholl, T., ... & Zuckerman, J. E. (2015). The human sex ratio from conception to birth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(16), E2102-E2111.
  37. Roff DA (1992) *The Evolution of Life Histories, Theory and Analyses*. Chapman & Hall
  38. Roff DA (2008) Defining fitness in evolutionary models. *J Genet* 87, 339-348.
  39. Rundnicki, R. , Mackey, M. C. (1994). Asymptotic similarity and Malthusian growth in autonomous and nonautonomous populations. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 187(2), 548-566.
  40. Sharpe FR, Lotka AJ (1911) L. A problem in age-distribution. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 21(124), 435-438.
  41. Shaw RF, Mohler JD (1953) The selective significance of the sex ratio. *Am Nat*, 87(837), 337-342.
  42. Stearns SC (1992) *The Evolution of Life Histories*. Oxford University Press.
  43. Taylor PD Williams, GC (1984) Demographic parameters at evolutionary equilibrium. *Can J Zool*, 62, 2264-2271.
  44. Van Veelen, M., & Spreij, P. (2009). Evolution in games with a continuous action space. *Economic Theory*, 39(3), 355-376.
  45. Vaupel JW, Manton KG, Stallard E (1979) The impact of heterogeneity in individual frailty on the dynamics of mortality. *Demography* 16(3), 439-454.
  46. Vaupel JW, Yashin AI (1983) *The deviant dynamics of death in heterogeneous populations*. Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis.
  47. Vaupel JW, Yashin AI (1985) Heterogeneity's ruses: some surprising effects of selection on population dynamics. *Am Stat*, 39(3), 176-185.
  48. Weibull J (1995) *Evolutionary Game Theory*. MIT Press.
  49. Vincent LT Brown J (2005) *Evolutionary Game Theory, Natural Selection, and Darwinian Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press
  50. Wieczorek A (2004) Large games with only small players and finite strategy sets. *Applcationes Mathematicae*, 1(31), 79-96.

- 
51. Wiczorek A (2005) Large games with only small players and strategy sets in Euclidean spaces. *Applicationes Mathematicae*, 2(32), 183-193.
  52. Wiczorek A, Wiszniewska A (1998) A game-theoretic model of social adaptation in an infinite population. *Applicationes Mathematicae*, 25, 417-430.
  53. Wolf M, McNamara JM (2012) On the evolution of personalities via frequency-dependent selection. *Am Nat* 179(6), 679-692.
  54. Wolf M, Van Doorn GS, Leimar O, Weissing FJ (2007) Life-history trade-offs favour the evolution of animal personalities. *Nature*, 447(7144), 581-584.
  55. Wolf M, Weissing FJ (2010) An explanatory framework for adaptive personality differences. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 365(1560), 3959-3968.
  56. Wolf, M., & Weissing, F. J. (2012) Animal personalities: consequences for ecology and evolution. *Trends Ecol Evol* 27(8), 452-461.

## Appendix A: Derivation of the frequency equations

**1) Discretization of the of McKendrick von Foerster model (10):** We need to divide the continuous time into separate discrete unit compartments describing age classes consisting of individuals of ages from the interval  $(l, l+1]$ . Recall that game round occur at intensity  $\tau$ . Note that the exponential dynamics emerges from aggregation of survival of some independent interactions, when the focal individual survives (or not) several events and the aggregated survival is the product of survival payoffs of those events. However we can imagine the timescale, where interactions are sufficiently rare that only some fraction of individuals will play a single round of the game. Then the dynamics is technically linear and the survival is described by first term of Taylor series of exponential function. Thus assume that time interval  $dt = dl = 1$  is small enough that the small fraction  $\tau d(t, l)dt$  individuals will die due to aggregated outcomes of independent game rounds. Remaining  $1 - \tau d(t, l)dt$  survivors will be transported to the next unit age compartment. Then from equation (9) we have that  $n(t+1, l+1) = (1 - \tau d(t, l))n(t, l) = s(t, l)n(t, l)$  which describes transport from point  $t, l$  to point  $t+1, l+1$ . Assume that

during unit interval all surviving individuals from age  $l$  will be moved to age  $l + 1$  while all individuals from  $l + 1$  will be moved from this age to the next age step or die. Therefore during single time unit we have linear transport occurring at an incoming rate  $s(t, l - 1)n(t, l - 1)$  and removing rate  $-n(t, l)$ , since all individuals will be removed during single time unit. Therefore this linear transport process can be well approximated by first order Taylor expansion for  $\Delta t = 1$  where the bracketed term can be interpreted as first derivative

$$n(t + 1, l) = n(t, l) + [s(t, l - 1)n(t, l - 1) - n(t, l)], \quad (77)$$

where the bracketed term constitutes derivative  $dn/dt$ , leading to the differential equation

$$\frac{dn(t, l)}{dt} = s(t, l - 1)n(t, l - 1) - n(t, l).$$

Note that (77) can be presented in the form  $n(t + 1, l) = s(t, l - 1)n(t, l - 1)$  which leads to the Leslie matrix (7). When we change notation to the numbered age classes describing age increments and assume that mortality  $s_i(t)$  and fertility  $\tau f(t)$  can change in time, we obtain the system

$$\dot{n}^0(t) = \sum_{i=0}^m n^i(t) \tau f^i(t) - n^0(t), \quad (78)$$

$$\dot{n}^i = s^{i-1}(t)n^{i-1}(t) - n^i(t) \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (79)$$

It is reasonable to assume that  $s^0 = 1$ , (other values are equivalent to  $s^0 = 1$  with rescaled fertilities  $f^i$ ) and  $s^m = 0$ .

However, to be compatible with replicator dynamics and game theoretic machinery, the dynamics should be expressed in terms of phenotype frequen-



cies. Let us change the coordinates to the frequencies  $a^i = \frac{n^i}{n}$  (with  $n = \sum_{i=1}^m n^i$ ) describing the age structure. The system (78,79) can be presented in the form of the Malthusian equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}^0(t) &= \sum_{i=0}^m n^i(t) \tau f^i(t) - n^0(t) = n^0(t) \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{n^i(t) \tau f^i}{n^0(t)} - 1 \right) \\ &= n^0(t) \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{a^i(t) \tau f^i(t)}{a^0(t)} - 1 \right),\end{aligned}\quad (80)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}^i(t) &= s^{i-1}(t) n^{i-1}(t) - n^i(t) = n^i(t) \left( \frac{n^{i-1}(t) s^{i-1}(t)}{n^i(t)} - 1 \right) \\ &= n^i(t) \left( \frac{a^{i-1}(t)}{a^i(t)} s^{i-1}(t) - 1 \right) \quad i = 1, \dots, m,\end{aligned}\quad (81)$$

Therefore, this system can be presented as a system of frequency dependent replicator equations  $\dot{a}^i = a^i(r^i - r)$  and a single equation on the scaling parameter  $\dot{n} = nr$ . Since  $\sum_{i=0}^m a^i = 1$  and  $s^m = 0$  we have that average Malthusian growth rate is

$$r = a^0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{a^i \tau f^i}{a^0} - 1 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^m a^i \left( \frac{a^{i-1} s^{i-1}}{a^i} - 1 \right) = \sum_{i=0}^m a^i (\tau f^i + s^i) - 1. \quad (82)$$

To add density dependence we should multiply fertility rate by logistic suppression coefficient  $\left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right)$ . Therefore we can formulate a system of frequency dependent replicator equations by transforming equation (81) for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  (the equation for 0 is redundant and can be removed and  $a^0 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m a^i$ ):

$$\dot{a}^i = a^i \left( \frac{a^{i-1}}{a^i} s^{i-1} - 1 - r \right) = a^{i-1} s^{i-1} - a^i \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i (\tau f^i + s^i) \right) \quad (83)$$

$$\dot{n} = nr = n \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i (\tau f^i + s^i) - 1 \right). \quad (84)$$

**2) Frequency dependence and the choice of time unit determining the discretization step:** When above system describes the dynam-

ics of the age structure of the subpopulation of carriers of some strategy competing with other strategies (indexed by subscripts) then the parameters  $s_j^i(t) = 1 - \tau d_j^i(p(t))$  and  $\tau f_j^i(t)$  (thus  $r_i = \tau \sum_{i=0}^m a^i (f^i - d^i)$ ) are game payoffs depending on strategy frequencies  $p_j = n_j / \sum_i n_i$  (and their age distributions, but now we limit our reasoning to strategy frequencies  $p$ ). Frequencies will change in time, therefore discretization step cannot be too big, since aggregated payoffs during unit interval will depend on the changes of vital rates  $\tau d_j^i(p(t))$  and  $\tau f_j^i(p(t))$  during that time interval. The time unit should be short enough that the vital rates will change significantly and the number of individuals will change nearly linearly within each age class. Thus we should analyze how much the strategy frequencies  $p_i$  can change during unit time and how this change affects the vital rates. Thus if for small  $\Delta t = 1$  we have change of  $\Delta n_i = n_i \tau r_i(t) \Delta t = n_i \tau \left( f_j^i(p(t)) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - d_j^i(p(t)) \right)$  (positive or negative) for each  $i$  leading to the change  $\Delta n = \sum_j \Delta n_j$  for the population size. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(t+1) &= \frac{n_i(t)}{n(t) + \Delta n} + \frac{\Delta n_i}{n(t) + \Delta n} = \frac{n_i(t)}{n(t)} \frac{n(t)}{n(t) + \Delta n} + \frac{\Delta n_i}{n(t) + \Delta n} \\ &= \frac{n_i(t)}{n(t)} \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta n}{n(t) + \Delta n} \right] + \frac{\Delta n_i}{n(t) + \Delta n} = p_i(t) + \frac{\Delta n_i - p_i(t) \Delta n}{n(t) + \Delta n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $p_i(t+1) = p_i(t) + \Delta p$  where vector  $\Delta p$  consists of

$$\Delta p_i(\tau) = \frac{\Delta n_i - p_i(t) \Delta n}{n(t) + \Delta n} = \frac{n_i(t) \tau r_i(t) - p_i(t) n(t) \tau r(t)}{n(t) + n(t) \tau r(t)} = \frac{\tau}{1 + \tau r(t)} p_i(t) (r_i(t) - r(t)) \quad (85)$$

Thus the pace of increment is nearly linear or slower since  $\frac{\tau}{(1 + \tau r(t))} < \tau$ . We can set the timescale by adjusting parameter  $\tau$  in the formulae  $\Delta f = f_j^i(p(t) + \Delta p(\tau)) - f_j^i(p(t))$  and  $\Delta d = d_j^i(p(t) + \Delta p(\tau)) - d_j^i(p(t))$  to make their values small enough (but infinitesimal) that  $\tau \Delta f$  and  $\tau \Delta d$  are negligible. For

the density factor we have that  $\left(1 - \frac{n(t+1)}{K}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{n(t)+\Delta n}{K}\right)$  and the change of fertility rate is  $-\tau f_j^i(p(t)) \frac{\Delta n}{K}$ , thus it depends on  $\tau/K$  and is negligible for even big time steps.

### Appendix B: The stationary age distribution and the Euler-Lotka equation in the continuous case

From (81), the stationary points for the age structure of this system are:

$$\frac{\hat{a}_{i-1} s_{i-1}}{\hat{a}_i} = \sum_{i=0}^m \hat{a}_i (f_i + s_i) \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (86)$$

therefore

$$\hat{a}_i = \frac{\hat{a}_{i-1} s_{i-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^m \hat{a}_i (f_i + s_i)} = \frac{\hat{a}_{i-1} s_{i-1}}{r(\hat{a}) + 1} \quad (87)$$

which implies that

$$\hat{a}_i = \frac{\hat{a}_0 \prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_z}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i}. \quad (88)$$

Then  $\sum_{i=0}^m \hat{a}_i = 1$  implies that

$$\hat{a}_0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{\prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_z}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i} \right) = 1 \Rightarrow \quad (89)$$

(note the similarity to the Euler-Lotka equation)

$$\hat{a}_0 = \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{\prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_z}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i} \right)^{-1}. \quad (90)$$

The stable age structure is a unique vector of frequencies among age classes, conditional on the average Malthusian growth rate of the population. Now let us prove the equivalence with the Euler-Lotka equation. After substitution of

the stable age frequencies from equation (88) into equation (80) we obtain:

$$\dot{n}_0 = n_0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{\hat{a}_i f_i}{\hat{a}_0} - 1 \right) = n_0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{f_i \prod_{z=0}^{i-1} s_z}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i} - 1 \right). \quad (91)$$

Frequency equilibrium implies that per capita growth rates in all age classes are equal to the average growth rate  $r(\hat{a})$ . Thus equality will also be satisfied for the growth rate of the 0 age class, leading to

$$\sum_{i=0}^m \frac{f_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} s_j}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^i} - 1 = r(\hat{a}) \Rightarrow \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{f_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} s_j}{(r(\hat{a}) + 1)^{i+1}} = 1, \quad (92)$$

which is the Euler-Lotka equation.

### Appendix C: Derivation of system $S_a$

We start from the Malthusian system describing the dynamics of age classes in the subpopulation of carriers of the  $j$ -th strategy:

$$\dot{n}_j^0 = \sum_{i=0}^m n_j^i f_j^i - n_j^0, \quad (93)$$

$$\dot{n}_j^i = s_j^{i-1} n_j^{i-1} - n_j^i. \quad (94)$$

According to (11) the above system can be transformed into the frequency replicator dynamics of age classes:

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i (f_j^i + s_j^i) \right). \quad (95)$$

The Malthusian equation describing the growth of the subpopulation of  $j$ -strategists is

$$\dot{n}_j = n_j r_j(a_j) = n_j \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i (f_j^i + s_j^i) - 1 \right). \quad (96)$$

Then we can derive the replicator dynamics describing the changes of strategy frequencies

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j (r_j - r) = p_j \left( (\bar{f}_j - \bar{f}) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right), \quad (97)$$

where  $r = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j r_j$ ,  $\bar{f}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i$ ,  $\bar{f} = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \bar{f}_j$ ,  $\bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i$  and  $\bar{s} = \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \bar{s}_j$  giving

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i (f_j^i + s_j^i) - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i (f_z^i + s_z^i) \right) = \quad (98)$$

$$p_j \left( \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i f_z^i \right) + \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i s_z^i \right) \right) \quad (99)$$

The equation on the scaling parameter is

$$\dot{n} = nr = n \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i (f_j^i + s_j^i) - 1 \right). \quad (100)$$

Then to add neutral density dependence the fertilities  $f_j^i$  should be multiplied by the logistic suppression coefficient  $(1 - n/K)$  leading to the system:

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left( \bar{f}_j \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s}_j \right), \quad (101)$$

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( (\bar{f}_j - \bar{f}) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right), \quad (102)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \bar{f} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} - 1 \right), \quad (103)$$

giving

$$\dot{a}_j^i = a_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left( \sum_{z=0}^m a_j^z f_j^z \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{z=0}^m a_j^z s_j^z \right) \quad (104)$$

$$\dot{p}_j = p_j \left( \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i f_z^i \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i s_z^i \right) \right), \quad (105)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i s_j^i - 1 \right). \quad (106)$$

#### Appendix D: Derivation of system $S_b$

System  $S_b$  produces a more complicated form of equations. As in the previous appendix, to add the neutral density dependence the fertilities should be multiplied by the logistic suppression coefficient  $\left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right)$ . Again we start from the Malthusian equations

$$\dot{n}_j^0 = \sum_{i=0}^m n_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - n_j^0 = n_j^0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{n_j^i}{n_j^0} f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - 1 \right), \quad (107)$$

$$\dot{n}_j^i = s_j^{i-1} n_j^{i-1} - n_j^i = n_j^i \left( s_j^{i-1} \frac{n_j^{i-1}}{n_j^i} - 1 \right). \quad (108)$$

Let us derive the Malthusian equations describing the growth of age classes in the global population. Then

$$n^i = \sum_{j=1}^w n_j^i, \quad p_j^i = \frac{n_j^i}{n^i}, \quad (109)$$

$$\dot{n}^0 = \sum_{j=1}^w \left( \sum_{i=0}^m n_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - n_j^0 \right) = \sum_{j=1}^w \sum_{i=0}^m n_j^i f_j^i \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^w n_j^0. \quad (110)$$

Since  $n^0 = \sum_{j=1}^w n_j^0$  and

$$\sum_{j=1}^w \sum_{i=0}^m n_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) = \sum_{i=0}^m n^i \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) = \quad (111)$$

$$n^0 \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{n^i}{n^0} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) = n^0 \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{a^i}{a^0} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right), \quad (112)$$

the above equation has form:

$$\dot{n}^0 = n^0 \left( \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{a^i}{a^0} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - 1 \right). \quad (113)$$

Analogously we have

$$\dot{n}^i = \sum_{j=1}^w (s_j^{i-1} n_j^{i-1} - n_j^i) = n^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - n^i. \quad (114)$$

In the new coordinates the equation for the population size will be :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{n} &= \sum_{i=0}^m \dot{n}^i = \sum_{i=0}^m n^i \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - n^0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \left( n^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - n^i \right) \\ &= n \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + n \sum_{i=1}^m a^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - n, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

and since  $s^m = 0$  we can denote the above equation as

$$\dot{n} = n (\bar{f} + \bar{s} - 1) = n \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i s_j^i - 1 \right). \quad (116)$$

Therefore the system (113,114,116) can be presented as the replicator dynamics (11,12)

$$\dot{a}^i = a^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a^i \sum_{z=0}^m a^z \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z f_j^z \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z s_j^z \right), \quad (117)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i s_j^i \right) - 1 \right). \quad (118)$$

The above system for each age class should be completed by the replicator dynamics describing the changes of strategic composition of this particular age class. Since  $a^i p_j^i = n_j^i/n$  we have the following form of (107):

$$\dot{n}_j^0 = n_j^0 \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i}{a^0 p_j^0} - 1 \right) \quad (119)$$

leading to the replicator dynamics

$$\dot{p}_j^0 = p_j^0 \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i}{a^0 p_j^0} - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^0 \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_z^i f_z^i}{a^0 p_z^0} \right) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) \quad (120)$$

$$= \frac{1}{a^0} \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i - p_j^0 \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^i f_z^i \right) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right), \quad (121)$$

analogously for other age classes we have that (108) can be presented as

$$\dot{n}_j^i = n_j^i \left( s_j^{i-1} \frac{a^{i-1} p_j^{i-1}}{a^i p_j^i} - 1 \right), \quad (122)$$

leading to the replicator dynamics

$$\dot{p}_j^i = p_j^i \left( \frac{a^{i-1} p_j^{i-1}}{a^i p_j^i} s_j^{i-1} - \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^i \frac{a^{i-1} p_z^{i-1}}{a^i p_z^i} s_z^{i-1} \right) \quad (123)$$

$$= \frac{a^{i-1}}{a^i} \left( p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - p_j^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^{i-1} s_z^{i-1} \right). \quad (124)$$

Now system  $S_b$  can be completed

$$\dot{p}_j^0 = \frac{1}{a^0} \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i p_j^i f_j^i - p_j^0 \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^i f_z^i \right) \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right), \quad (125)$$

$$\dot{p}_j^i = \frac{a^{i-1}}{a^i} \left( p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - p_j^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^{i-1} s_z^{i-1} \right), \quad (126)$$



$$\dot{a}^i = a^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^{i-1} s_j^{i-1} - a^i \sum_{z=0}^m a^z \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z f_j^z \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^z s_j^z \right), \quad (127)$$

$$\dot{n} = n \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \left( \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i f_j^i \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^w p_j^i s_j^i \right) - 1 \right). \quad (128)$$

This is the system (26,27,28,29).

## 5 Appendix E: Rescaling the McKendrick von Foerster model to frequencies

We can rescale McKendrick von Foerster (10) equation to relative frequencies  $a(t, l) = n(t, l)/n(t)$  where  $n(t) = \int_0^\infty n(t, l) dl$  is the size of the whole population. Since  $n(t, l) = a(t, l)n(t)$  and the dynamics of the population size satisfies Malthusian equation  $\frac{dn(t)}{\delta t} = n(t)r$  equation (10) can be presented as

$$\frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta t} n(t) + \frac{\delta n(t)}{\delta t} a(t, l) + \frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta l} n(t) = -\tau d(l) a(t, l) n(t),$$

after substitution  $\frac{dn(t)}{\delta t} = n(t)r$  and division by  $n(t)$  leading to

$$\frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta a(t, l)}{\delta l} = a(t, l) [-\tau d(l) - r], \quad (129)$$

where per capita growth rate  $r = \bar{f} \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) - \bar{d} = \tau \left[ \int_0^\infty a(t, l) f(l) dl - \int_0^\infty n(t, l) d(l) dl \right]$

and the boundary condition will be  $a(t, 0) = n(t, 0)/n(t) = \tau \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) \int_0^\infty a(t, l) f(l) dl$

. Note that we can remove  $\tau$  from equation (129) by change of the timescale.

We can use equation (129) as the PDE equivalent of equations (20) form system  $S_a$  and (28) from  $S_b$ . Similarly we can rescale equation (10) to  $p_j(t, l) = n_j(t, l)/n(t, l)$  (where  $n(t) = \sum_j n_j(t, l)$ ) to obtain PDE equivalent of equa-

tions (26,27). Then since  $n_j(t, l) = p_j(t, l)n(l)$

$$\frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta t} n(t, l) + \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta t} p_j(t, l) + \frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta l} n(t, l) + \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta l} p_j(t, l) = -\tau d(l) p_j(t, l) n(t, l)$$

this leads to

$$\left[ \frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta l} \right] n(t, l) + \left[ \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta l} \right] p_j(t, l) = -\tau d(l) p_j(t, l) n(t, l)$$

then substituting (10)  $\frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta n(t, l)}{\delta l} = -\tau \bar{d}(t, l) n(t, l)$  and division by  $n(t, l)$  leads to:

$$\frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta t} + \frac{\delta p_j(t, l)}{\delta l} = -\tau p_j(t, l) [d(l) - \bar{d}(t, l)],$$

and the boundary condition replacing equation (26) is  $p_j(t, 0) = n_j(t, 0)/n(t, 0) = \tau \left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right) \int_0^\infty p_j(t, l) f(l) dl$ . Parameter  $\tau$  can be removed in resulting equivalents of systems  $S_a$  and  $S_b$  by the timescale adjustment.

## Appendix F: Derivation of the payoff functions for the age structured sex ratio model

Our operational payoff functions (41) and (43) can be presented in new coordinates in the following way:

$$f_m^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{x}{y} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{x_j}{y_j} P_j \right), \quad (130)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{1 - M_j^{op}}{M_j^{op}} P_j \right), \quad (131)$$

$$f_f^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( (1 - P_j) + \frac{y_j}{x_j} (1 - \bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{x}{y} \right), \quad (132)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left( (1 - P_j) + \frac{M_j^{op}}{1 - M_j^{op}} (1 - \bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right). \quad (133)$$

Note that in the age structured case  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $x_j$  and  $y_j$  describe the numbers of sexually active individuals of both sexes. Males are active in age classes from  $a$  to  $b$  and females from  $c$  to  $d$ . Fractions of sexually active females and males in the new formulation can be presented in the form:

$$S_j^f = \sum_{i=c}^d a_j^i (1 - M_j^i) \quad \text{and} \quad S_j^m = \sum_{i=a}^b a_j^i M_j^i. \quad (134)$$

Then  $\bar{S}^f = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j S_j^f$  and  $\bar{S}^m = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j S_j^m$  are the respective averages, and operational sex ratios are  $M_j^{op} = \frac{S_j^m}{S_j^m + S_j^f}$  and  $P_{op} = \frac{\bar{S}^m}{\bar{S}^m + \bar{S}^f}$ . Then the operational fertility payoff function of a gene carrier will be

$$\begin{aligned} f_g^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) &= M_j^{op} f_m^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) + (1 - M_j^{op}) f_f^{op}(P_j, a, G, M), \\ &= \frac{k}{2} \left( M_j^{op} \left( \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{1 - M_j^{op}}{M_j^{op}} P_i \right) + (1 - M_j^{op}) \left( (1 - P_j) + \frac{M_j^{op}}{1 - M_j^{op}} (1 - \bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right) \right), \\ &= \frac{k}{2} \left( M_j^{op} \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \bar{P}_{pr} + (1 - M_j^{op}) P_j + (1 - M_j^{op}) (1 - P_j) + M_j^{op} (1 - \bar{P}_{pr}) \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right), \\ &= \frac{k}{2} \left( (1 - M_j^{op}) + M_j^{op} \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

To obtain the per capita gene carrier fertility payoff, which is necessary for derivation of the replicator equations, the above function should be multiplied by the fraction of active carriers

$$\left[ S_j^m + S_j^f \right] = \left[ \sum_{i=a}^b a_j^i M_j^i + \sum_{i=c}^d a_j^i (1 - M_j^i) \right] \quad (136)$$

leading to

$$f_g(P_j, a, G, M) = \frac{k}{2} \left( (1 - M_j^{op}) + M_j^{op} \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right) \left[ S_j^m + S_j^f \right] = \quad (137)$$

$$\frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right) = \quad (138)$$

$$\frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \right). \quad (139)$$

Similarly we can derive the per capita average fertility. Then the original average payoff (48) becomes the operational average fertility of the active individual

$$f^{op}(a, G, M) = k(1 - P_{op}). \quad (140)$$

Again to obtain the per capita average fertility payoff we should multiply this function by the fraction of active individuals in the population  $\sum_{j=1}^w G_j [S_j^m + S_j^f] = \bar{S}^m + \bar{S}^f$ . This leads to

$$\bar{f}(a, G, M) = k(1 - P_{op})(\bar{S}^m + \bar{S}^f) = k\bar{S}^f. \quad (141)$$

## 6 Appendix G Derivation of the age structured replicator equations

The bracket describing the fertility stage of the gene pool dynamics will be

$$(f_g(P_j, a, G, M) - \bar{f}(a, G, M)) = \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right) - k\bar{S}^f \quad (142)$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} \left[ S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} - 2\bar{S}^f \right] = \frac{k}{2} \left[ S_j^f + \left[ \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} - 2 \right] \bar{S}^f \right] = \quad (143)$$

$$k \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{S_j^f}{\bar{S}^f} + \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \right) - 1 \right] \bar{S}^f. \quad (144)$$

The bracket describing the mortality stage will be

$$(\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) = \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i \bar{s}_j^i - \sum_{z=1}^w G_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i \bar{s}_z^i \right), \quad (145)$$

$$= \left( \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i [M_j^i \bar{s}_m^i + (1 - M_j^i) \bar{s}_f^i] - \sum_{z=1}^w G_z \sum_{i=0}^m a_z^i [M_z^i \bar{s}_m^i + (1 - M_z^i) \bar{s}_f^i] \right), \quad (146)$$

since  $\bar{s}_j^i = M_j^i s_m^i + (1 - M_j^i) s_f^i$  is the average survival of the  $j$ th strategy carrier in age class  $i$  and

$$\bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m a_j^i [M_j^i s_m^i + (1 - M_j^i) s_f^i] \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{s} = \sum_{j=1}^w G_j \bar{s}_j \quad (147)$$

are the average  $P_j$  carriers survival and average survival probabilities in the population, leading to equation (65)

$$\dot{G}_j = G_j \left( k \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{S_j^f}{\bar{S}^f} + \frac{S_j^m}{\bar{S}^m} \right) - 1 \right] \bar{S}^f \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + (\bar{s}_j - \bar{s}) \right). \quad (148)$$

Now let us derive the equations describing the dynamics of sex ratios in the particular age classes in the subpopulation of carriers of strategy  $P_j$  which will be equivalent to the original equations on  $M_j$ . We will use the version of equation (30) for two types where the same payoffs are obtained in certain age ranges specific for each type. In effect (30) reduces to the single equation:

$$p^0 = \frac{f_1 \sum_{i=a}^b a^i p^i - p^0 \bar{f}}{a^0} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right), \quad (149)$$

since  $\bar{f} = \sum_{i=0}^m a^i \sum_{z=1}^w p_z^i f_z^i$  in (30) is the average fertility in the population (in our case the subpopulation of carriers of the  $i$ -th sex ratio strategy). To translate the above equation into the notation used in the sex ratio model we should apply the following substations:  $p^0 \rightarrow M_j^0$ ,  $f_1 \rightarrow f_m^{op}$ ,  $f_2 \rightarrow f_f^{op}$  and  $\bar{f} \rightarrow f_g$  since  $\sum_{i=a}^b a^i p^i$  is equivalent to  $S_j^m$ . Here there are no different strategies indexed by a lower index but two opposite sexes, thus any particular gene we will have a single equation describing the sex ratio in the zero age class:

$$\dot{M}_j^0 = \frac{(f_m^{op}(P_j, a, G, M) S_j^m - M_j^0 f_g(P_j, a, G, M))}{a_j^0} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right). \quad (150)$$

Recall that  $(1 - M_j^{op})/M_j^{op} = S_j^f/S_j^m$  and  $(1 - P_{op})/P_{op} = \bar{S}^f/\bar{S}^m$  leads to equation 67

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_j^0 &= \frac{\left( \frac{k}{2} \left( \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \bar{P}_{pr} + \frac{1 - M_j^{op}}{M_j^{op}} P_j \right) S_j^m - M_j^0 \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{1 - P_{op}}{P_{op}} \right) \right)}{a_j^0} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) \\ &= \frac{k}{2a_j^0} \left( S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \bar{P}_{pr} + S_j^m \frac{S_j^f}{S_j^m} P_j - M_j^0 S_j^f + -M_j^0 S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) \\ &= \frac{k}{2a_j^0} \left( S_j^m (\bar{P}_{pr} - M_j^0) \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} + S_j^f (P_j - M_j^0) \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

Note that the above equation is equivalent to the Tug of War dynamics of the original model. Thus the above equation should be completed by the respective equations for all age classes (31), which are equations (68)

$$\dot{M}_j^i = \frac{a_j^{i-1}}{a_j^i} (M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1} - M_j^i \bar{s}_j^{i-1}). \quad (152)$$

The equations describing the age structure (32) of the entire population of carriers of the  $j$ -th strategy (with  $f_g$  acting as  $\bar{f}_i$ ) will be equations (66)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{a}_j^i &= a_j^{i-1} \bar{s}_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left[ f_g(P_j, a, G, M) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s}_j \right] = \\ &= a_j^{i-1} \left[ M_j^{i-1} s_m^{i-1} + (1 - M_j^{i-1}) s_j^{i-1} \right] - a_j^i \left[ \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s}_j \right] \\ &= a_j^{i-1} \bar{s}_j^{i-1} - a_j^i \left[ \frac{k}{2} \left( S_j^f + S_j^m \frac{\bar{S}^f}{\bar{S}^m} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{K} \right) + \bar{s} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

From (64) and (57) we obtain population size equation (69). Therefore we derived system (65,66,67,68,69).

### Figure captions

**Fig.1.** Schematic presentation of the discretization of the continuous age dynamics. Assumed time step between age classes  $\gamma$  is associated with change of the population state, which may induce change of the frequency dependent payoffs. However, while resulting changes of the vital rates are negligible values

---

$n$ -population size
$n_j$ -number of individuals carrying $j$ -th strategy
$\tau$ -interaction rate
$f_j$ ( $f_j^i$ ) -fertility payoff of the $j$ -th strategy (of the $j$ -th strategy at age $i$ )
$s_j = 1 - d_j$ ( $s_j^i$ ) -survival payoff of the $j$ -th strategy (of the $j$ -th strategy at age $i$ )
$\bar{f}_j, \bar{f}^i, \bar{f}$ -average fertility for the $j$ -th strategy, $i$ -th age class, whole population
$\bar{s}_j = 1 - \bar{d}_j, \bar{s}^i = 1 - \bar{d}^i, \bar{s} = 1 - \bar{d}$ -average survival for $j$ -th strategy, $i$ -th age class, whole population
$r$ -Malthusian parameter (unsuppressed growth rate)
$m + 1$ -number of age classes
$w$ -number of strategies
$K$ -carrying capacity, maximal population load
$L_j(a_j) = \bar{f}_j / \bar{d}_j$ -turnover coefficient of the $j$ -th strategy
$\bar{L} = \bar{f} / \bar{d}$ -average turnover coefficient of the whole population
$a_j^i$ -frequency of individuals at age $i$ among $j$ -strategists
$p_j$ -frequency of $j$ -strategists in the population
$a^i$ -proportion of individuals in the $i$ -th age class
$p_j^i$ -frequency of $j$ -strategists in the $i$ -th age class
$\Phi^i$ -background fertility in the $i$ -th age class
$\Psi^i$ -background mortality in the $i$ -th age class
$x$ ( $x_j$ ) -number of females (carrying the $j$ -th strategy)
$y$ ( $y_j$ ) -number of males (carrying the $j$ -th strategy)
$G_j = (x_j + y_j) / \sum_{l=1}^w (x_l + y_l)$ -frequency of the $i$ -th strategy gene
$P = y / (x + y)$ -secondary sex ratio (proportion of males)
$\bar{P}_{pr}$ -primary sex ratio (average strategy of females)
$S_j^f = \sum_{l=c}^d a_j^l (1 - M_j^l)$ -proportion of active females among the $i$ -th strategy carriers
$S_j^m = \sum_{l=a}^b a_j^l M_j^l$ -proportion of active males among the $i$ -th strategy carriers
$M_j$ ( $M_j^i$ ) -sex ratio of the population of the $j$ th strategy carriers (of $j$ th strategy carriers at age $i$ )
$\bar{s}_j^i$ -average survival of the $j$ th sex ratio strategy carrier in age class $i$
$M_j^{op} = S_j^m / (S_j^m + S_j^f)$ -operational sex ratio of $j$ -th strategists
$P_{op} = \bar{S}^m / (\bar{S}^m + \bar{S}^f)$ -operational sex ratio in the population

---

**Table 1** List of important symbols

of payoffs can be approximated by their initial values at the beginning of transition between age classes.

**Fig. 2.** The difference between two alternative formulations of the problem: system a describes the evolution of the gene pool according to age structures of carrier subpopulations, system b describes evolution of the global age structure driven by strategy selection in age classes.

**Fig. 3.** The extension of the phase space of the sex ratio model to the age structured case. The gene pool phase space is completed by respective subspaces describing the age structures among carriers of the particular genes, as in the system  $S_a$ . Then each age structure subspace is completed by subspaces describing carriers sex ratios, according to system  $S_b$

**Fig. 4.** Panel a) dynamics of gene frequencies, panel b) operational sex ratios for strategies  $M_{0.05}^{op}$ ,  $M_{0.55}^{op}$ ,  $M_{0.95}^{op}$  and primary and operational sex ratio of the population  $\bar{P}_{pr}$  and  $P_{op}$ , panel c) population size. Trajectories show that  $P_{op}$  is the threshold between growth and decline of the gene frequency depending on the value of  $M_i^{op}$ . This is shown by the example of strategy 0.05, where bumps in the marked areas are caused by passing of the operational sex ratios the average value  $P_{op}$  and by change of the strategic situation caused by passing the 0.5 value by average operational sex ratio  $P_{op}$ .

**Fig. 5.** Trajectories of age classes. Initial behavior is caused by huge differences in initial sex ratios. Assumed changes in age specific survivals slightly affect the trajectories.


**Fig. 6.** Trajectories of age specific sex ratios. Pattern caused by assumed changes in survivals is clearly visible.

**Fig. 7.** Plot of the convergence to the respective Euler-Lotka manifolds for arbitrarily chosen age classes for strategy 0.05. The convergence is delayed by some inertia caused by age dynamics.


**Fig. 8.** Plots of the excess fertility payoffs  $(f_g(P_i, a, G, M) - \bar{f}(a, G, M))$ , excess mortality payoffs  $(\bar{s}_i - \bar{s})$  and the gene frequency growth rates  $(f_g - \bar{f})(1 - n/K) + (\bar{s}_i - \bar{s})$  from the gene pool dynamics (65). Fertility payoffs are not equal as in the classical theory, and the same situation is true for mortality payoffs, but the right hand sides of equations are zero. This shows that the explanation of the primary sex ratio of 0.5 needs an explicit consideration of the interplay between fertility and mortality.




a) discretization of the age structure




b) impact of the state change induced by discretization step on the values of payoff functions and resulting vital rates





System S<sub>a</sub>




System S<sub>b</sub>






age structure of the strategy 0.05



age structure of the strategy 0.55



age structure of the strategy 0.95

