

From extortion to generosity, evolution in the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

Alexander J. Stewart¹, Joshua B. Plotkin^{1,2}

¹ Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

² E-mail: jplotkin@sas.upenn.edu

Recent work has revealed a new class of “zero-determinant” (*ZD*) strategies for iterated, two-player games. *ZD* strategies allow a player to unilaterally enforce a linear relationship between her score and her opponent’s score, and thus achieve an unusual degree of control over both players’ long-term payoffs. Although originally conceived in the context of classical, two-player game theory, *ZD* strategies also have consequences in evolving populations of players. Here we explore the evolutionary prospects for *ZD* strategies in the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD). Several recent studies have focused on the evolution of “extortion strategies” – a subset of zero-determinant strategies – and found them to be unsuccessful in populations. Nevertheless, we identify a different subset of *ZD* strategies, called “*generous ZD* strategies,” that forgive defecting opponents, but nonetheless dominate in evolving populations. For all but the smallest population sizes, *generous ZD* strategies are not only robust to being replaced by other strategies, but they also can selectively replace any non-cooperative *ZD* strategy. *Generous* strategies can be generalized beyond the space of *ZD* strategies, and they remain robust to invasion. When evolution occurs on the full set of all IPD strategies, selection disproportionately favors these *generous* strategies. In some regimes, *generous* strategies outperform even the most successful of the well-known Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma strategies, including win-stay-lose-shift.

Introduction

Press and Dyson [1] recently revealed a remarkable class of strategies, called “zero-determinant” (*ZD*) strategies, for iterated two-player games. *ZD* strategies are of particular interest in the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD), the canonical game used to study the emergence of cooperation among rational individuals [2–9]. By allowing a player to unilaterally enforce a linear relationship between her payoff and her opponent’s payoff, Press and Dyson argue, *ZD* strategies provide a sentient player unprecedented control over the longterm outcome of Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma games. In particular, Press and Dyson highlighted a subset of *ZD* strategies, called “extortion strategies,” that grant the extorting player a disproportionately high payoff when employed against a naive opponent who blindly adjusts his strategy to maximize his own payoff.

A natural response to Press and Dyson is to ask: What are the implications of *ZD* strategies for an evolving population of players [10]? Although several recent studies have begun to explore this question [11,12], they have focused almost exclusively on extortion strategies. Extortion strategies are not successful in evolving populations, unless the population size is very small. Like all strategies that prefer to defect rather than to cooperate, extortion strategies are vulnerable to strategies that reward cooperation but punish defection. However, there is more to *ZD* strategies than just extortion, and recent work has uncovered some *ZD* strategies that promote cooperation in two-player games [10,13]. Here we consider the full range of *ZD* strategies in a population setting and show that, when it comes to evolutionary success, it is generosity, not extortion, that rules.

arXiv:1304.7205v3 [q-bio.PE] 27 Dec 2013

We begin our analysis by considering populations restricted to the space of *ZD* strategies. We show that evolution within *ZD* always leads to a special subset of strategies, which we call *generous ZD*. *Generous ZD* strategies reward cooperation, but punish defection only mildly, and they tend to score lower payoffs than defecting opponents. Next, we build on recent work by Akin [13], who identified *generous* strategies beyond those contained within *ZD*. We demonstrate that a large proportion of these *generous* strategies are robust to replacement in an evolving population. The robust, *generous* strategies can at worst be replaced neutrally. Conversely, we demonstrate that most *generous* strategies can readily replace resident non-*generous* strategies in a population. As a result, *generous* strategies are just as, or sometimes even more, successful than the most successful of well-known Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma strategies in evolving populations. Finally, we show that populations evolving on the full set of Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma strategies spend a disproportionate amount of time near *generous* strategies, indicating that they are favored by evolution.

Methods and Results

In the Prisoner’s Dilemma, two players X and Y must simultaneously choose whether to cooperate (c) or defect (d). If both players cooperate (cc) then they each receive payoff R . If X cooperates and Y defects (cd), then X loses out and receives the smallest possible payoff, S , while Y receives the largest possible payoff, T . If both players defect (dd), then both players receive payoff P . Payoffs are specified so that the reward for mutual defection is less than the reward for mutual cooperation, i.e. $T > R > P > S$. It is typically assumed that $2R > T + S$, so that it is not possible for total payoff received by both players to exceed $2R$. In what follows we will consider the payoffs $T = B$, $R = B - C$, $P = 0$ and $S = -C$, which comprise the so-called “donation game” [12].

The Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) consists of infinitely many successive rounds of the Prisoner’s Dilemma. Press and Dyson [1] showed that it is sufficient to consider only the space of memory-1 strategies, i.e. strategies that specify the probability a player cooperates each round in terms of the payoff she received in the previous round. Memory-1 strategies consist of four probabilities, $\mathbf{p} = \{p_{cc}, p_{cd}, p_{dc}, p_{dd}\}$. In particular, Press and Dyson [1] showed that the longterm payoff to a memory-1 player pitted against an arbitrary opponent is the same as her payoff would be against some other, memory-1 opponent. Thus, we limit our analysis to memory-1 players without loss of generality (see also Materials and Methods).

Evolutionary game theory

In the context of evolutionary game theory, we consider a population of N individuals each characterized by a strategy \mathbf{p} . We say strategy \mathbf{p} receives longterm payoff $\pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ against an opponent with strategy \mathbf{q} . The success of a strategy depends on its payoff when pitted against all individuals in the population [14–17]. Traditionally, the evolutionary outcome in such a population has been understood in terms of evolutionary stable strategies (ESS). A strategy \mathbf{p} is an ESS if its longterm payoffs satisfy $\pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}) > \pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$, or $\pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}) = \pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ and $\pi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) > \pi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q})$, for all opponents $\mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{p}$.

The ESS condition provides a useful notion of stability in the context of an infinite population. However, in a finite population, the concept must be generalized to consider whether selection favors both invasion and replacement of a resident strategy by a mutant strategy [18, 19]. In a finite, homogenous population of size N , a newly introduced neutral mutation (i.e. a mutation that does not change the payoff to either player) will eventually replace the entire population with probability $\rho = 1/N$. A deleterious mutation, which is opposed by selection, will fix with probability $\rho < 1/N$; while an advantageous mutation, which is favored by selection, will fix with probability $\rho > 1/N$. We say that a resident strategy \mathbf{p} in a finite population of size N is *evolutionary robust* against a mutant strategy \mathbf{q} if the probability of replacement satisfies $\rho \leq 1/N$; in other words, the robust strategy cannot be selectively replaced by the mutant strategy. In the limit of infinite population size, $N \rightarrow \infty$, the condition $\rho < 1/N$ reduces to the ESS condition.

When selection is weak ($\sigma \ll 1$), we can write down an explicit criterion for robustness: a resident Y is evolutionary robust against a mutant X if and only if (see Materials and Methods and [18, 19])

$$s_{xx}(N - 2) + s_{xy}(2N - 1) \leq s_{yx}(N + 1) + 2s_{yy}(N - 2), \quad (1)$$

where we denote the longterm payoff of player X against player Y by s_{xy} . We restrict our analysis to memory-1 players. In the two-player setting this restriction does not sacrifice generality, because, as per Press & Dyson [1], the payoff received by a memory-1 strategy Y can be determined independently of her opponent's memory. However, in an evolutionary setting, Y 's success depends also on the payoff her opponent receives against himself. Nonetheless we will show that our results for *generous* strategies hold against all opponents, no matter how long their memories, provided the standard IPD assumption $2R > T + S$ holds.

Zero-determinant strategies, extortion, and generosity

Among the space of all memory-1 IPD strategies, Press and Dyson identified a subspace of so-called “zero-determinant” (ZD) strategies that ensure a fixed, linear relationship between two players' longterm payoffs. If player Y facing player X employs a ZD strategy of the form

$$\begin{aligned} p_{cc} &= 1 - \phi(1 - \chi)(B - C - \kappa) \\ p_{dc} &= 1 - \phi[\chi C + B - (1 - \chi)\kappa] \\ p_{cd} &= \phi[\chi B + C + (1 - \chi)\kappa] \\ p_{dd} &= \phi(1 - \chi)\kappa, \end{aligned}$$

then their payoffs will satisfy the linear relationship

$$\phi[s_{xy} - \chi s_{yx} - (1 - \chi)\kappa] = 0. \quad (2)$$

The parameters χ and κ must lie in the range $0 \leq \kappa \leq B - C$ and $\max\left(\frac{\kappa - B}{\kappa + C}, \frac{\kappa + C}{\kappa - B}\right) \leq \chi \leq 1$ to produce a feasible strategy. Eq. 2 defines the full space of ZD strategies introduced by Press & Dyson [1]. Within this space, two particular subsets are of special interest: the extortion strategies, described by Press & Dyson, for which $\kappa = P = 0$ and $\chi > 0$, and the *generous* strategies, described in our commentary [10], for which $\kappa = R = B - C$ and $\chi > 0$.

Extortion strategies ensure that either the extortioner Y receives a higher payoff than her opponent X , $s_{yx} > s_{xy}$, or otherwise both players receive the payoff for mutual defection, $s_{yx} = s_{xy} = 0$. In contrast, *generous* strategies ensure that both players receive the payoff for mutual cooperation, $s_{yx} = s_{xy} = B - C$, or otherwise the *generous* player Y receives a lower payoff than her opponent, $s_{yx} < s_{xy}$.

Recent work has focused on the evolutionary prospects of extortioners [11, 12], and found that such strategies are unsuccessful, except in very small populations. In fact, as we will show below, selection favors replacement of extortioners by *generous* strategies; whereas *generous* strategies are robust to replacement by extortioners. Moreover, the success of *generous* strategies persists when evolution proceeds within the full space IPD strategies.

Evolution of generosity within ZD strategies

We start by identifying the subset of ZD strategies that are evolutionary robust against all IPD strategies in a population of size N . Substituting Eq. 2 into Eq. 1 shows that a resident ZD strategy Y with $\kappa_y = B - C$ is robust against any mutant IPD strategy X if and only if $\chi_y \geq (N + 1)/(2N - 1)$ (see Materials and Methods). Conversely, provided $N > 2$, any resident ZD strategy Y with $\kappa_y < B - C$ can be selectively replaced by another strategy – namely, by a ZD strategy with $\kappa_x = B - C$ and $\chi_x > (N + 1)/(2N - 1)$ (see Materials and Methods). Hence, those ZD strategies with $\kappa = B - C$ and $\chi \geq (N + 1)/(2N - 1)$ are precisely the ZD strategies that are evolutionary robust against all IPD strategies. We denote this set of robust ZD strategies as ZD_R :

$$ZD_R = \left\{ (\kappa, \chi, \phi) \mid \kappa = B - C, 1 > \chi \geq \frac{N+1}{2N-1} \right\}.$$

Here ϕ is left unconstrained, but it must lie in the range required to produce a feasible strategy, $0 < \phi \leq \chi B / (\chi C + B)$.

The robust ZD strategies are what we call *cooperative*, meaning they satisfy $\kappa = B - C$. Any *cooperative* player will agree to mutual cooperation when facing another *cooperative* player, and so they each receive payoff $B - C$. If a *cooperative* strategy further satisfies the condition $\chi > 0$ then we say that the strategy is *generous* – meaning that any deviation from mutual cooperation causes the *generous* player’s payoff to decline more than that of her opponent. The robust ZD strategies are all *generous*.

We now consider evolution in a population of $N > 2$ players restricted to the space of ZD strategies. Because selection favors replacement of any non-*cooperative* ZD strategy by some member of ZD_R , we expect evolution within the space of ZD strategies to tend towards *generous* strategies – and thereafter to remain at *generous* strategies, because ZD_R is robust. This expectation is confirmed by Monte-Carlo simulations of well-mixed populations of IPD players (Fig. 1). Following [12,20], we modeled evolution as a process in which individuals copy successful strategies with a probability that depends on their relative payoffs (see Materials and Methods). As Fig. 1 shows, evolution within the set of ZD strategies proceeds from extortion ($\kappa = 0$ and $\chi > 0$) to generosity ($\kappa = B - C$ and $\chi > 0$). In fact, even populations initiated with $\chi < 0$ evolve to generosity (Fig. S1).




Figure 1: Evolution from extortion to generosity within the space of ZD strategies. Populations were simulated in the regime of weak mutation. The figure shows the ensemble mean value of κ in the population, plotted over time. $\kappa = 0$ corresponds to the extortion strategies of Press & Dyson, whereas $\kappa = B - C$ corresponds to the *generous* ZD strategies. Each population was initialised at an extortion strategy E_χ , with χ drawn uniformly from the range $\chi \in (0, 1]$. Given a resident strategy in the population, mutations to κ were proposed as normal deviates of the resident strategy, truncated to constrain $\kappa \in [0, B - C]$, while mutations to $\{\chi, \phi\}$ were drawn uniformly from $\max\left(\frac{\kappa - B}{\kappa + C}, \frac{\kappa + C}{\kappa - B}\right) \leq \chi \leq 1$ with ϕ drawn uniformly within the feasible range given κ and χ . A proposed mutant strategy replaces the resident strategy with a fixation probability dependent on their respective payoffs, as in [12,20]. The mean κ among 10^3 replicate populations is plotted as a function of time. Parameters are $B = 3$, $C = 1$, $N = 100$, and selection strength $\sigma = 1$.

Good strategies

The *generous ZD* strategies identified above are best understood by comparison with the space of *good* strategies recently introduced by Akin [13]. A *good* strategy stabilizes cooperative behavior in the two-player IPD: by definition, if both players adopt *good* strategies then each receives payoff $B - C$ and neither player can gain by unilaterally changing strategy. All *good* strategies are *cooperative*, i.e. they have $\kappa = B - C$. Moreover, the *generous ZD* strategies described above are precisely the intersection of *good* strategies [13] and *ZD* strategies [1] (Fig. 2).




Figure 2: The relationship between *ZD* and *good* strategies in the Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma. The intersection between *ZD* and *good* is precisely the set of *generous ZD* strategies. Not all *good* strategies are *generous*. As a result, only a strict subset of *good* strategies are evolutionary robust, just as a strict subset of *ZD* strategies are evolutionary robust. Extortion strategies are neither *generous* nor evolutionary robust. Also shown are the locations of the classical IPD strategies [19] win-stay-lose-shift, tit-for-tat, and generous tit-for-tat.

We can identify the space of memory-1 *good* strategies as those of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_{cc} &= 1 - \phi(1 - \chi)(B - C - \kappa) \\
 p_{dc} &= 1 - \phi[\chi C + B - (1 - \chi)\kappa + \lambda] \\
 p_{cd} &= \phi[\chi B + C + (1 - \chi)\kappa - \lambda] \\
 p_{dd} &= \phi(1 - \chi)\kappa,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $-1 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and $-(\chi B + C) \leq \lambda \leq (B + \chi C)$ are required to produce a feasible strategy. Sufficient conditions for set G of *good* strategies are (see Supporting Information)

$$\begin{aligned}
 G &= \{(\kappa, \chi, \phi, \lambda) \mid \\
 &\quad \kappa = B - C, \lambda > -(B - C)\chi, \lambda > -(B + C)\chi\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the parameter ϕ is left unconstrained except that it must produce a feasible strategy. Numerics indicate these sufficient conditions are also necessary (see Supporting Information). Note that the *good* strategies with $\lambda = 0$ correspond precisely to the *generous ZD* strategies.

It is interesting to note that, in addition to tit-for-tat and generous tit-for-tat, which are *ZD*, the set of *good* strategies also contains win-lose-stay-shift, which is widely known as one of the most evolutionary successful IPD strategies [7]. Nonetheless, even though win-lose-stay-shift is *good*, it is not *generous* (it has $\chi = -C/B < 0$, Fig. 3). Because it lacks generosity, win-lose-stay-shift can in fact be out-competed in evolving populations, as we shall see below.




Figure 3: The space of all *cooperative* IPD strategies, projected onto the parameters χ and λ . The boundary of the simplex delineates the set of feasible strategies with $\kappa = B - C$. Strategies colored light blue or dark blue are *good*; whereas strategies colored dark blue are both *good* and evolutionary robust, under weak selection. Setting $\lambda = 0$ recovers the space of cooperative *ZD* strategies (red line). Note that all robust strategies are *generous* (i.e. $\chi > 0$ and $\kappa = B - C$). Each point in the figure, $\{\chi, \lambda\}$, has an associated range of ϕ values, and thus corresponds to multiple IPD strategies. However, the evolutionary robust *good* strategies resist replacement by any other strategy, regardless of the choice of ϕ . The figure illustrates the robust region for a large population size; whereas Eq. 3 gives the exact N -dependent conditions for robustness. Also shown are the locations of several classical IPD strategies. Tit-for-tat ($\chi = 1$) and generous tit-for-tat ($\chi = 0$) are limiting cases of *generous ZD* strategies, but they are not robust. Likewise, win-stay-lose-shift is *good* but not robust.

Evolutionary of generosity within *good* strategies

In this section we ask which *good* strategies are evolutionary robust; and we find that the robust *good* strategies are always *generous* – i.e. have $\chi > 0$, regardless of λ . In the case of *ZD*, the conditions for evolutionary robustness do not depend on the parameter ϕ . Similarly, we will derive conditions for the robustness of *good* strategies that hold regardless of ϕ .

Application of Eq. 1 allows us to derive the conditions for a *good* strategy to be evolutionary robust against all IPD strategies in a population of size N (see Supporting Information). The resulting set, G_R , of evolutionary robust *good* strategies satisfies

$$G_R = \left\{ (\kappa, \chi, \phi, \lambda) \mid \begin{aligned} &\kappa = B - C, \chi < 1, \\ &\lambda > \frac{B - C}{3N} [N + 1 - (2N - 1)\chi], \\ &\lambda > \frac{B + C}{N - 2} [N + 1 - (2N - 1)\chi] \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Here ϕ is left unconstrained except that it must produce a feasible strategy. These analytical conditions for robustness are confirmed by Monte-Carlo simulations (Fig. S2). Setting $\lambda = 0$ in the equation above recovers the conditions we previously derived for the robustness of *ZD* strategies. As in the case of *ZD*, the robust *good* strategies are exclusively limited to *generous* strategies (i.e. strategies with $\kappa = B - C$ and $\chi > 0$, see Fig. 3).

Interestingly, the strategy win-stay-lose-shift does not lie within the region of robust *good* strategies (Fig. 3). As a concrete demonstration of this result we have identified a specific strategy that selectively replaces win-lose-stay-shift in a finite population (see Supporting Information and Fig. S3). Furthermore, even under strong selection, and under increased mutation rates, win-stay-lose-shift can be dominated by some strategies (Fig. S3).

The evolutionary success of generosity

We have shown that *generous* strategies are evolutionarily robust and eventually dominate in a population, when players are confined to the space of *ZD* strategies. We have also shown that amongst the *good* strategies, which stabilize cooperative behavior, the evolutionary robust strategies, G_R , are also *generous*. To complement these results, we now systematically query the evolutionary success of *generous* strategies in general, by allowing a population to explore the full set of memory-1 strategies $\mathbf{p} = \{p_{cc}, p_{cd}, p_{dc}, p_{dd}\}$ and quantifying how much time the population spends near generosity.

Following [12, 21], we performed simulations in the regime of weak mutation, so that the population is monomorphic for a single strategy at all times. Mutant strategies, drawn uniformly from the space $\{p_{cc}, p_{cd}, p_{dc}, p_{dd}\}$, are proposed at rate μ . A proposed mutant either immediately fixes or is immediately lost from the population, according to its fixation probability calculated relative to the current strategy in the population [12, 20]. Over the course of this simulation we quantified how much time the population spends in a δ -neighborhood of *ZD*, ZD_R , G , and G_R strategies, as well as extortion strategies (Fig. 4). The δ -neighborhood of a strategy set is defined as those strategies within Euclidean distance δ of it, among the space of all memory-1 strategies. If the proportion of time spent in the δ -neighborhood is greater than would be expected by random chance (which is proportional to the volume of the δ -neighborhood), then evolution is said to favor that set of strategies.

It is already known that, except for very small populations, a population spends far less time near extortion strategies than expected by random chance, and that the same is true for the set of all *ZD* strategies [11, 12]. Thus, extortion and *ZD* strategies in general are disfavored by evolution in populations. This has led to the view the *ZD* strategies are of importance only in the setting of classical two-player game theory, and not in evolving populations [22]. However, in Fig. 4 we repeat this analysis but we additionally report the δ -neighborhoods of ZD_R , G , and G_R strategies. We find that, except in very

small populations, selection strongly favors G , G_R , and, especially, ZD_R strategies. In particular, the population spends more than 100-times longer in the neighborhood of ZD_R strategies than expected by random chance. Thus, ZD contains a subset of strategies that are remarkably successful in evolving populations.

We also analyzed the time spent near each individual *good* strategy, under both weak and strong selection. We found that the strategies most strongly favored by selection are virtually all *generous* (Fig. S4). The remaining *good* strategies are typically moderately favored by selection, with the exception of those near win-stay-lose-shift, which are also strongly favored.




Figure 4: *Generous* strategies are favored by selection in evolving populations. We simulated a population under weak mutation, proposing mutant strategies drawn uniformly from the full set of memory-1 IPD strategies. We calculated the time spent in the δ -neighborhood [12] of ZD and extortion strategies, as well as robust ZD strategies, *good* strategies and robust *good* strategies, relative to their random (neutral) expectation. For small population sizes, extortioners are abundant and *generous* strategies are nearly absent. As population size increases, the frequency of *generous* strategies and *good* strategies is strongly amplified by selection; whereas extortion strategies, and ZD strategies in general, are disfavored, as previously reported [12]. Simulations were run until the population fixed 10^7 mutations. Parameters are $B = 3$, $C = 1$, $\delta = 0.05$, and selection strength $N\sigma = 100$.

The success of *generous* strategies against classic IPD strategies

To complement the weak-mutation studies described above, we also compared the performance of *generous* ZD strategies against several classic IPD strategies, in a finite population of players [12, 18–20], assuming either strong or weak mutation (i.e. high or low mutation rates). We performed Monte-Carlo simulations of populations constrained to different subsets of strategies, similar to those of [12]. In these simulations, a pair of individuals is chosen from the population at each time step, and the first individual copies the strategy of the second with a probability that depends on their respective payoffs, as above. Mutations also occur, with probability μ , so that the mutated individual randomly adopts another strategy from the set of strategies being considered. We ran simulations at a variety of population sizes, ranging from

from $N = 2$ to $N = 1,000$.

At very small population sizes, defector strategies tend to dominate (Fig. S5), reflecting the fact that extortion pays in the classic two-player setting [1]. However, as the population size increases, *good* strategies, such as win-stay-lose-shift, and *generous ZD* quickly begin to dominate (Fig. S5). Which strategy does best depends on the population size, the mutation rate, and the set of available strategies (Figs. S5-S6). In some regimes *generous ZD* strategies outperform even win-stay-lose-shift (Fig. S5).

Discussion

We have shown that *generous* strategies tend to dominate in evolving populations of IPD players. This is a surprising result because, when faced with a defector strategy, *generous* strategies must by definition suffer a greater reduction in payoff than their opponent suffers. And so one might expect such strategies to be vulnerable to replacement by defector strategies – whereas in fact, we have shown, the reverse is true. Likewise, one might expect *generous* strategies to be unsuccessful at displacing resident strategies in a population. However, simulations reveal (Figs. S7-S8) that most *generous* strategies can selectively replace almost all other IPD strategies.

How can we account for the remarkable evolutionary success of generosity? First, it is important to note that the most successful *generous* strategies are not *too generous*. For example, in a large population, evolutionary robust *ZD* strategies must have $\chi > 1/2$: that is, they must reduce their payoff when faced with a defector opponent, but not by too much. Second, whilst *generous* strategies score less than defector strategies in head-to-head matches, they are able to limit the difference between their own payoff and their opponent’s payoff (see Materials and Methods). As a result, they tend to have a consistent probability $\rho > 1/N$ of replacing a diversity of resident IPD strategies (Fig. S8), allowing them to succeed in an evolutionary setting.

We found that *generous ZD* strategies are particularly successful when mutations arise at an appreciable rate. Under such circumstances, *ZD_R* strategies can dominate even win-stay-lose-shift, a perennial favourite in evolving populations [7, 11, 23, 24]. Over all, selection strongly favors *generous ZD* strategies when evolution proceeds in the full space of memory-1 strategies. These results strongly contravene the view that *ZD* strategies are of little evolutionary importance [22]. In fact, we have shown that a subset of *ZD* strategies, the *generous* ones, are strongly favored in the evolutionary setting.

The discovery and elegant definition of *ZD* strategies remains a remarkable achievement, especially in light of decades worth of prior research on the Prisoner’s Dilemma in both the two-player and evolutionary settings. *ZD* strategies comprise a variety of new ways to play the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma, and Akin’s generalization of *cooperative ZD* to *good* strategies provides novel insight into how cooperation between two rational players can be stabilized. However, in an evolutionary setting, amongst both *ZD* and *good* strategies, it is the *generous* ones that are most successful.

Appendix

Notation: For ease of analysis, the parameter χ we use throughout is the inverse of that used by Press & Dyson [1]. In addition, to avoid confusion with δ -neighborhoods, we use λ in place of Akin’s δ [13].

Evolutionary simulations

We simulated a well-mixed population in which selection follows an “imitation” process [12, 20]. At each, discrete time step, a pair of individuals (X, Y) is chosen at random. X switches its strategy to imitate Y

with probability $f_{x \rightarrow y}$,

$$f_{x \rightarrow y} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[\sigma(s_x - s_y)]},$$

where s_x and s_y denote the average IPD payoffs of players X and Y against the entire population, and σ denotes the strength of selection. When a mutant strategy X is introduced to a population otherwise consisting of a resident strategy Y , its probability of fixation, ρ is given by

$$\rho = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^i e^{\sigma[(j-1)s_{yy} + (N-j)s_{yx} - js_{xy} - (N-j-1)s_{xx}]}}. \quad (4)$$

Taylor expansion to first order about $\sigma = 0$ gives Eq. 1, the condition for selective replacement of Y by X under weak selection.

Evolutionary robustness of cooperative ZD strategies

Suppose that a resident strategy Y is cooperative and ZD. We will show that Y is evolutionary robust if and only if $\chi \geq (N+1)/(2N-1)$. From Eq. 1 we deduce that Y is robust against any mutant IPD strategy X iff their payoffs satisfy

$$s_{xy}(2N-1) \leq s_{yx}(N+1) + (B-C)(N-2).$$

Using Eq. 2 to substitute for s_{yx} yields the equivalent condition

$$[(B-C) - s_{xy}](\chi(2N-1) - (N+1)) \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, we know that $B-C \geq s_{xy}$ for any mutant X (because, otherwise Eq. 2 would imply that both s_{yx} and s_{xy} exceed $B-C$, which contradicts the assumption $2R > T+S$). Therefore the cooperative ZD strategy Y is robust if and only if $\chi \geq (N+1)/(2N-1)$.

Non-cooperative ZD strategies can be selectively replaced

Here we show that a resident ZD strategy Y with $\kappa_y < B-C$ is selectively replaced by a ZD strategy X with $\kappa_x = B-C$ and $\chi_x > (N+1)/(2N-1)$. Since both players are ZD, their payoffs satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_x s_{xy} - \chi_x \kappa_x &= s_{yx} - \kappa_x \\ \chi_y s_{yx} - \chi_y \kappa_y &= s_{xy} - \kappa_y. \end{aligned}$$

which result in the payoff matrix. Substituting these payoffs into Eq. 1 shows that X can selectively

	X	Y
X	κ_x	$\frac{(1-\chi_y)\kappa_y + \chi_y(1-\chi_x)\kappa_x}{(1-\chi_y\chi_x)}$
Y	$\frac{(1-\chi_x)\kappa_x + \chi_x(1-\chi_y)\kappa_y}{(1-\chi_y\chi_x)}$	κ_y

replace Y iff

$$\begin{aligned} &[(2(1-\chi_x)(1+\chi_y - N\chi_y) + (1-\chi_y)(1+\chi_x - N\chi_x))] \times \\ &(\kappa_x - \kappa_y) < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

By our assumptions on X and Y , $\kappa_x - \kappa_y > 0$ and $\chi_x > 1/(N-1)$. If $\chi_y > 1/(N-1)$ then inequality (5) is satisfied, and so X is selected to replace Y . If $\chi_y < 1/(N-1)$ then, to determine the conditions for which

X is selected to replace Y we make the coordinate transformation $\chi_y^* = \chi_y - \frac{1}{N-1}$ and $\chi_x^* = \chi_x - \frac{1}{N-1}$, so that $\chi_x^* > 0$ and $\chi_y^* < 0$. The inequality (5) is then satisfied provided

$$-2 \left(1 - \chi_x^* - \frac{1}{N-1}\right) \chi_y^* - \left(1 - \chi_y^* - \frac{1}{N-1}\right) \chi_x^* < 0.$$

Rearranging this gives

$$\chi_x^* > \frac{-2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{N-1}\right) \chi_y^*}{\left(1 - 3\chi_y^* - \frac{1}{N-1}\right)}$$

which is hardest to satisfy when χ_y^* is at its minimum, i.e. $\chi_y^* = -1 - \frac{1}{N-1}$. This results in the inequality

$$\chi_x > \frac{N+1}{2N-1} \quad (6)$$

as a sufficient condition for X to selectively replace Y . This sufficient condition is met by our assumption on X . And so non-cooperative ZD strategies can always be selectively replaced, provided $N > 2$.

Generous strategies limit the difference between their payoff and their opponent's payoff

Consider Eq. 2 for a generous ZD strategy Y facing an arbitrary opponent X :

$$\phi [s_{xy} - \chi s_{yx} - (1 - \chi)(B - C)] = 0.$$

Rearranging this expression gives the difference in the players' payoffs

$$s_{xy} - s_{yx} = (1 - \chi)((B - C) - s_{yx}).$$

Increasing χ reduces the difference between two players' payoffs, regardless of the opponent's strategy. This is also true for generous good strategies, which satisfy

$$s_{xy} - s_{yx} = (1 - \chi)((B - C) - s_{yx}) - \lambda(v_{cd} + v_{dc})$$

where v_{cd} denotes the equilibrium rate of the play (cd) and v_{dc} the equilibrium rate of the play (dc) [13]. The ability of generous strategies to limit the difference in payoffs with arbitrary opponents accounts for their remarkable consistency as invaders, as exemplified in Fig. S8. On the other hand, a non-generous strategy, such as win-stay-lose-shift, is subject to larger differences between her payoff and her opponent's payoff, leading to less consistent success as an invader (Fig. S8).

Long-memory strategies

Our results for the evolutionary success of generous strategies in a finite population also hold against longer-memory opponents. As per Press & Dyson, from the perspective of a memory-1 player, a long-memory opponent is equivalent to a memory-1 opponent. Thus the payoff s_{xy} can be determined by considering only the set of memory-1 strategies. However the payoff a long-memory opponent receives against itself, s_{xx} , may depend on its memory capacity. Nonetheless, under the standard IPD assumption $2R > T + S$ the highest total payoff for any pair of players in the IPD is $2R$; and so $s_{xx} \leq R$. This condition on s_{xx} is the only condition required to derive our results on the robustness of ZD and good strategies (see Supporting Information), and so our results continue to hold even against long-memory invaders.

Literature Cited

- [1] Press WH, Dyson FJ (2012) Iterated prisoner’s dilemma contains strategies that dominate any evolutionary opponent. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109:10409–13.
- [2] Rapoport A, Chammah AM (1965) *Prisoner’s dilemma: a study in conflict and cooperation* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor).
- [3] Axelrod R, Hamilton WD (1981) The evolution of cooperation. *Science* 211:1390–6.
- [4] Axelrod R (1984) *The evolution of cooperation* (Basic Books, New York).
- [5] Fudenberg D, Maskin E (1986) The folk theorem in repeated games with discounting or with incomplete information. *Econometrica* 50:533–554.
- [6] Fudenberg D, Maskin E (1990) Evolution and cooperation in noisy repeated games. *American Economic Review* 80:274–279.
- [7] Nowak M, Sigmund K (1993) A strategy of win-stay, lose-shift that outperforms tit-for-tat in the prisoner’s dilemma game. *Nature* 364:56–8.
- [8] Trivers R (1971) The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review Biology* 46:35–71.
- [9] Boerlijst MC, Nowak MA, Sigmund K (1997) Equal pay for all prisoners. *American Mathematical Monthly* 104:303–307.
- [10] Stewart AJ, Plotkin JB (2012) Extortion and cooperation in the prisoner’s dilemma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109:10134–5.
- [11] Adami C, Hintze A (2012) Winning isn’t everything: Evolutionary stability of zero determinant strategies. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.2666>.
- [12] Hilbe C, Nowak MA, Sigmund K (2013) Evolution of extortion in iterated prisoner’s dilemma games. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.
- [13] Akin E (2012) Stable cooperative solutions for the iterated prisoner’s dilemma. *arXiv:1211.0969*.
- [14] Maynard Smith J (1973) The logic of animal conflict. *Nature* 246.
- [15] Maynard Smith J (1982) *Evolution and the theory of games* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [16] Hofbauer J, Sigmund K (1998) *Evolutionary games and population dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [17] Boyd R, Gintis H, Bowles S (2010) Coordinated punishment of defectors sustains cooperation and can proliferate when rare. *Science* 328:617–20.
- [18] Nowak MA, Sasaki A, Taylor C, Fudenberg D (2004) Emergence of cooperation and evolutionary stability in finite populations. *Nature* 428:646–50.
- [19] Nowak MA (2006) *Evolutionary dynamics: exploring the equations of life* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.).
- [20] Traulsen A, Nowak MA, Pacheco JM (2006) Stochastic dynamics of invasion and fixation. *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys* 74:011909.

- [21] Imhof LA, Nowak MA (2010) Stochastic evolutionary dynamics of direct reciprocity. *Proc Biol Sci* 277:463–8.
- [22] Ball P (2012) Physicists suggest selfishness can pay. *Nature* doi:10.1038/nature.2012.11254.
- [23] Imhof LA, Fudenberg D, Nowak MA (2007) Tit-for-tat or win-stay, lose-shift? *J Theor Biol* 247:574–80.
- [24] Iliopoulos D, Hintze A, Adami C (2010) Critical dynamics in the evolution of stochastic strategies for the iterated prisoner’s dilemma. *PLoS Comput Biol* 6:e1000948.