

1 **From Cues to Signals: Evolution of Interspecific Communication Via Aposematism**  
2 **and Mimicry in a Predator-Prey System**

3 Kenna D. S. Lehmann<sup>1,3,4,\*</sup>, Brian W. Goldman<sup>2,3</sup>, Ian Dworkin<sup>1,3,4</sup>, David M.  
4 Bryson<sup>3</sup>, Aaron P. Wagner<sup>3</sup>

5 1 Department of Zoology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

6 2 Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Michigan State University, East  
7 Lansing, MI, USA

8 3 BEACON Center for the Study of Evolution in Action, Michigan State University, East  
9 Lansing, MI, USA

10 4 Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology, and Behavior, Michigan State University,  
11 East Lansing, MI, USA

12 \* E-mail: Corresponding [kdslehmann@gmail.com](mailto:kdslehmann@gmail.com)

13 **Abstract**

14 Current evolutionary theory suggests that many natural signaling systems evolved from  
15 preexisting cues. In aposematic systems, prey warning signals benefit both predator and  
16 prey. When the signal is highly beneficial, a third species often evolves to mimic the  
17 unpalatable species, exploiting the signaling system for its own protection. We  
18 investigated the evolutionary development of predator cue utilization and prey signaling  
19 in a digital predator-prey system in which mimicking prey could evolve to alter their  
20 appearance to resemble poison-free or poisonous prey. In predators, we observed rapid

21 evolution of cue recognition (i.e. active behavioral responses) when presented with  
22 sufficiently poisonous prey. In addition, active signaling (i.e. mimicry) evolved in prey  
23 under all conditions that led to cue utilization. Thus we show that despite imperfect and  
24 dishonest signaling, given a high cost of consuming poisonous prey, complex systems of  
25 interspecific communication can evolve via predator cue recognition and prey signal  
26 manipulation. This provides evidence supporting hypotheses that cues may serve as  
27 stepping-stones in the evolution of more advanced communication systems and signals  
28 incorporating information about the environment.

29 **Key Words:** aposematism; signals; digital evolution; mimicry; predator-prey

### 30 **Introduction**

31 Signaling systems represent a basic form for inter- and intraspecific communication.  
32 Signals are an evolved means of actively conveying information and influencing the  
33 behavior of receivers. In contrast, cues are passive, non-evolving biological and  
34 environmental traits that inherently provide the observer with information. Organisms  
35 have evolved to use both signals and cues to inform their behavior. One of the most  
36 pervasive examples of signaling systems in the animal world is aposematism: the warning  
37 coloration of poisonous and distasteful species. Aposematism occurs in a wide variety of  
38 taxa [1–3] and has been heralded as one of the most striking examples of evolution [4].  
39 The characteristics of these aposematic signaling systems are highly variable. Chief  
40 among these, the toxicity of the aposematic prey (i.e. the model) and the occurrence,  
41 palatability, and accuracy of mimics are disparate across systems. Studies of a variety of  
42 aposematic systems have provided insight into a vast number of evolutionary concepts  
43 including character displacement [5], frequency dependence [6,7], diversity [8,9], gene

44 flow [10], co-evolution and co-evolutionary arms races [11,12], and adaptive landscapes  
45 [13]. However, despite these studies and the development of theoretical models on  
46 aposematic signaling and mimicry[14–21], we do not fully understand the conditions  
47 necessary for their evolution because no studies have been able to investigate their  
48 evolution from a primordial system. To complicate matters further, predator learning is  
49 not fully understood and its importance for the evolution of aposematism and mimicry  
50 likely varies between species.

51 Current theory suggests that evolution of the aposematic signaling in unpalatable species  
52 is highly adaptive because it benefits both predator and prey [15]: prey benefit when  
53 predators learn to avoid them, predators benefit by avoiding harmful prey. Such signaling  
54 systems often include one or more species that mimic the aposematic signal in order to  
55 avoid predator attacks. In Müllerian mimicry, a number of species share a common  
56 warning signal to advertise unpalatability. The species within such mimicry rings share  
57 the costs associated with educating a common predator [22]. In contrast, Batesian mimics  
58 advertise a warning signal while remaining palatable [23]. This dishonest signal benefits  
59 only the mimic and is detrimental to the unpalatable signaler and the receiving predator  
60 because it degrades the information quality of the aposematic signal.

61 In terms of accuracy of mimic signals, for both Müllerian and Batesian mimicry,  
62 predation on imperfect mimics is expected to select for perfect mimicry, or automimicry  
63 (e.g., [24]). For automimicry systems, quantitative models suggest that levels of  
64 protection enjoyed by the mimic scale with the noxiousness and palatability of the model  
65 prey [25,26]. In addition, a number of experimental studies have shown that accurate  
66 mimicry evolves when the model is scarce relative to the abundance of mimics [6].

67 Although selection often favors automimicry, stable systems of imperfect mimicry are  
68 prevalent in nature and occur under many conditions [18–20]. In order to describe the  
69 processes by which they can evolve, systems of imperfect mimicry have been widely  
70 studied from both the theoretical [21,24,27–32] and experimental perspectives  
71 [18,20,25,33–37]. From these, two primary effects seem to support the evolution of  
72 imperfect mimics. First, selective pressure for perfect mimicry relaxes when imperfect  
73 mimics are rare relative to the model or when imperfect mimics are unprofitable due to  
74 other factors (e.g., size or agility) [18,38]. Second, predators also exert less selective  
75 pressure on imperfect mimics when they generalize the unpalatable poisonous prey’s  
76 characteristics, leading to behavioral avoidance of any species that exhibit these  
77 generalized traits [18,39,40].

78 In order to determine the evolutionary pathways leading from a naïve predator-prey  
79 system to a fully functional aposematic signaling system, quantitative models have  
80 outlined the theoretical conditions under which aposematic signaling systems stabilize  
81 (e.g., [13,26,41–50]). However, such models require substantial simplification of the  
82 signaling system, assumptions of unnatural conditions, or reliance on extant signaling  
83 systems (bringing us full circle). Additionally, no studies have been able to  
84 experimentally examine the conditions necessary for the realized evolution of predator-  
85 prey signaling systems. This is a difficult challenge, given that, in order to fully evaluate  
86 the conditions necessary for the evolution of aposematic signaling, one must observe its  
87 evolution in a naïve system where signaling has not yet evolved. However, all predators  
88 available for experiments have preexisting and established signal recognition systems. To  
89 resolve these issues, we used the digital evolution research platform Avida [51] to test the

90 conditions leading to the evolution of a mimicry signal from an aposematic cue in a  
91 coevolutionary predator-prey system. We tested for levels of toxicity necessary for the  
92 evolutionary emergence of (1) recognition of signaling cues by predators and (2)  
93 dishonest signaling by prey mimics. Highly toxic model species are predicted to support  
94 more numerous and less accurate mimics [18–20,38,39]. Further, the maintenance of a  
95 dishonest signal, as in Batesian mimicry, is expected to require accurate mimicry when  
96 an abundant signal accompanies low toxicity [25,26]. Accordingly, we also tested the  
97 level of mimic accuracy required to support a successful Batesian mimic population  
98 while varying the levels of model toxicity. We hypothesized that these two conditions  
99 (high toxicity or accurate mimicry) provide the necessary selective pressures for  
100 dishonest signaling to arise from an existing cue.

## 101 **Materials and Methods**

102 We used the digital evolution software Avida to assess the conditions facilitating the  
103 evolution of predators that utilize cues to inform their behavior and prey that actively  
104 signal, via mimicry, and influence the feeding habits of cue-receptive and cue-sensitive  
105 predators. Avida organisms have a sequence of program instructions that controls their  
106 behavior and serves as genetic information inherited by their offspring. Instructions  
107 executed on the genome dictate the actions taken by an organism, allowing it to sense and  
108 interact with the environment (e.g., obstacles, food, other organisms), process  
109 information, or reproduce. The genome replication process is imperfect, allowing for the  
110 introduction of mutations into offspring genomes. Differential fitness in the populations  
111 occurs as a consequence of mutations producing novel combinations of operations.  
112 Combined, these properties of Avida provide the conditions necessary for adaptive

113 evolution via natural selection: replication, inheritance, variation, and differential fitness  
114 [52]. Over the course of evolution, digital organisms in Avida often exhibit behaviors  
115 similar to biological organisms observed in natural systems [44].

116 We configured Avida to enable predator-prey interactions [53] using a modified form of  
117 Avida's Heads-EX hardware [54]. To allow for the evolution of predators, we included  
118 an attack instruction that could mutate into an organism's genome, making it capable of  
119 consuming other organisms. In our digital ecosystems, prey species consumed spatially  
120 distributed, limited resources across a 251x251 grid-cell environment. Once resources in  
121 a cell were consumed, the environmental resource was replenished at a rate of 0.01  
122 resource units per cell per update, to a maximum per-cell level of 1 full unit (1 unit =  
123 minimum level consumable by prey). Prey organisms could utilize sensory information  
124 and movement instructions to locate and reach edible resources. Predators (once evolved)  
125 had the same set of potential genetic instructions as prey. Thus predators could evolve to  
126 use the same instructions to locate and consume prey, through which they gained all of  
127 their previously collected resources. All organisms were required to consume a total of 10  
128 units of resource before they could reproduce, either directly from the environment (prey)  
129 or from consuming prey that had consumed resources (predators). Reproduction was thus  
130 limited by resource consumption: the faster an organism gathered food, the sooner it  
131 could reproduce. Thus, for predators, advantageous mutations were those that allowed for  
132 more rapid targeting and capturing of prey. Likewise, any prey mutations that conferred  
133 greater foraging efficiency or predator avoidance skills, would give prey a selective  
134 advantage.

135 Prey organisms were divided into three classes of morphs: non-poisonous, poisonous, and

136 mimic. To control for subpopulation size effects, and because predators could not act as a  
137 top-down control on the poison prey class, classes were assigned at birth such that 50%  
138 were poisonous, 25% were safe, and the remaining 25% were potential mimics. The  
139 designated class was a part of the prey's phenotype visible to other organisms. Each  
140 morph class foraged for separate environmental resources.

141 'Non-poisonous' prey organisms directly transferred their gathered resources to predators  
142 when consumed. The 'poison' prey organisms, upon consumption, reduced a predator's  
143 gathered resources by a factor (i.e. 'poison level', see below) of what that prey had  
144 previously gathered. The 'mimic' prey provided the same resource benefit as 'non-  
145 poisonous' prey when consumed by a predator. However, mimic prey were unique in  
146 that, if it had mutated into their genome, they could execute an instruction that allowed  
147 them to change their visible phenotype to that of a different prey class. This instruction  
148 had no effect on organisms not in the mimic class. Displayed and visible classes provided  
149 a cue for predators, and an evolutionary opportunity for them to evolve abilities for  
150 recognizing and avoiding poisonous prey. If these behaviors evolved, mimics would then  
151 be able to further evolve to manipulate that cue, avoiding predation by providing the  
152 predators with a false signal.

153 Predators were classified as such as soon as they made their first kill. The prey class  
154 preference of each predator was determined by a specific instruction sequence defining  
155 the 'attack organism operation' (see Table 1). The default sequence, constituting a single  
156 attack instruction, performed a 'generalist' attack, targeting any prey organism in the cell  
157 in front of the predator, regardless of the prey's displayed signal. Three additional attack

158 options consisted of an attack instruction followed by one of eight modifying instructions  
159 distributed across three classes such that three specified a safe prey attack, three mapped  
160 to mimic prey type attack, and two mapped to a poisonous prey attack. If the victim's  
161 displayed class did not match the specified attack type (i.e. predator preference), the  
162 attack would fail. As a result, a predator's prey preference was explicitly heritable,  
163 though multiple preferences could be expressed if multiple attack instruction sequences  
164 existed within the predator's genome. Under most treatments, when a predator attacked a  
165 mimic, in order to make a kill, the predator's expressed prey preference had to match the  
166 mimic's displayed class (i.e. what it mimicked), not its true class. Select treatments, as  
167 noted in the results, further altered the fidelity of the apparent prey phenotype such that  
168 predators perceived the true class, instead of the displayed class, with the specified  
169 probability.

170 All experiments were started with the introduction of one prey organism from each class.  
171 Each organism's genome was 100 instructions long, and each of these ancestors simply  
172 moved randomly through the Avida landscape, attempting to consume sufficient  
173 resources to reproduce. Genetic mutation rates applied to offspring genomes were a 0.25  
174 probability of a single instruction substitution, and a 0.05 probability each that a single  
175 instruction would be inserted or deleted. Assignment of offspring to prey classes ensured  
176 that half of all prey born were safe for predators to eat, and that the cue from the  
177 poisonous prey outnumbered any signaling by the mimics. Importantly, this does not  
178 mean heeding the cue was always advantageous: the reward for eating a signaling mimic  
179 may have outweighed the penalty for eating a poisonous prey. Furthermore, as we  
180 controlled only birth ratios, it was possible for the number of mimics in a given

181 population to outnumber the poisonous prey. In such cases, if enough mimics  
182 successfully signaled that they were poisonous, it could be advantageous for a predator to  
183 ignore the signal and feed on the excess mimics. Assigning classes in this way also  
184 helped stabilize the system, preventing the extinction of any one prey class.

185 Because predators could not act as a top-down control on the poisonous prey class, we  
186 limited the number of prey in each class to 1,000 organisms and imposed the following  
187 method of class-specific population size limitations. Whenever an organism was born, it  
188 was assigned to a prey class. If the inclusion of the newly born organism would increase  
189 the number of prey in that class beyond the prey type cap, a random existing individual  
190 from that class was removed from the population. This method follows the same logic  
191 used in Avida by default in which population sizes are limited by physical space  
192 constraints, except that we applied independent limits to each class, instead of to the  
193 population as a whole. We set resource inflow levels sufficiently high to ensure that they  
194 did not directly limit prey population levels. Consequently, cases in which a prey class  
195 population was substantially less than 1,000 specifically indicated that the class was top-  
196 down limited by predators. Unlike the three prey classes, predators were not limited to a  
197 maximum class size: predator resources (i.e. prey) were always finite and in a negative  
198 frequency relationship with the predator population size.

199 All populations were evolved for 500,000 updates (an update is an arbitrary time unit in  
200 Avida, roughly equivalent to the time required for each organism in the population to  
201 execute 30 genomic instructions). We utilized identical configuration parameters for all  
202 treatments, only varying the efficacy of the poison by manipulating the poison level  
203 associated with the poison prey (levels used: 0.01, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.75, and

204 1.0), as specified in the results. We conducted 30 replicate runs for each treatment. In  
205 practice, early population extinctions (due to excessive predation) reduced sample sizes  
206 in four treatments: at the 0.01, 0.025, 0.05, and 0.1 poison efficacy levels, 8, 2, 2, and 2  
207 of the populations were lost and excluded from our analyses.

208 We used Avida version 2.12 for all experiments. Data were post-processed using Python  
209 2.7.1 and the pylab and matplotlib libraries from the Enthought Python Distribution  
210 version 7.02-2. Statistical analyses and plotting were conducted in R version 2.15.2 using  
211 the libraries ggplot2 version 0.9.3.1, gridExtra version 0.9.1, and boot version 1.3-5.

212

## 213 **Results**

214 We tested for levels of toxicity necessary for the evolutionary emergence of signal  
215 recognition from a cue by predators and dishonest signaling by prey mimics. We also  
216 tested the level of mimic accuracy required to support a successful mimic population.

217

### 218 *Predator Recognition of a Cue*

219 We assessed the conditions under which predators evolved to preferentially avoid  
220 consuming poisonous prey using a logistic regression model that related predation levels  
221 to the eight levels of toxicity of the poisonous prey (0.01, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.75,  
222 1.0). In this model, we classified each of the 30 poison prey sub-populations as being  
223 under predation pressure if their realized abundance fell below 800 individuals (80% of  
224 the maximum) at the end of the experimental trial. This threshold was chosen arbitrarily  
225 during preliminary data analysis in an effort to reduce noise as experimental abundances  
226 were either significantly above or significantly below this value, but the individual

227 abundance values were highly stochastic. Based on the proportion of evolved  
228 populations in which poison prey were not under predation pressure, the model predicts  
229 the probability that predators will evolve to preferentially avoid consuming poisonous  
230 prey at a given a poison efficacy level (Figure 1). At poison levels below 0.1 the selective  
231 pressure to avoid such prey is weak, resulting in a low probability that predators evolved  
232 selective predation habits. However, when the efficacy of the poisonous prey is at or  
233 above 0.1, predator populations nearly universally evolve to avoid predating poisonous  
234 prey. To illustrate the potential realized cost of consuming a poisonous prey, a poison  
235 level of 0.1 would cause a 10% reduction in the resources available for an attacking  
236 predator to satisfy the threshold for reproduction (10 units). As such, in order to  
237 compensate for 10% ‘energetic’ loss, if a predator had previously stored 9 units, it would  
238 now have to consume two young prey that each had consumed 1 unit of environmental  
239 resource, or one better-fed prey that had consumed 2 units. On the other hand, had that  
240 same predator killed a non-poisonous species, it could reproduce immediately.

241

#### 242 *Selective Targeting of Prey Types*

243 For all tested poison levels, the three prey classes rapidly grew toward the population cap  
244 until predators began exerting top-down controlling pressure (Figure 2). At low poison  
245 levels (Figures 2a and 2b), mimic and safe prey subpopulation sizes remained relatively  
246 comparable and constant throughout evolution, suggesting that predators were consuming  
247 prey in proportion to their availability and not distinguishing between poisonous and non-  
248 poisonous phenotypes. However, at higher poison levels (Figures 2c and 2d), the  
249 poisonous prey subpopulations converged to the maximum sub-population size,

250 indicating that they were no longer under top-down predation control and that predators  
251 had evolved selective targeting of non-poisonous prey. At the same time, realized  
252 predator population sizes were higher in high poison efficacy trials. This indicates that  
253 predators could have benefited from evolving skills for discriminating prey at low poison  
254 levels. However, at these levels, the selection pressures were not (apparently) strong  
255 enough for predator populations to realize this potential in the allotted evolutionary time.

### 256 *Evolved Manipulation of a Communicative Signal*

257 In all populations, prey evolved to alter their apparent phenotypic signal (i.e. appearance)  
258 when in the mimic class (Figure 3). However, at low poison levels (0.025 and 0.05,  
259 Figure 3a and 3b, respectively), mimic class prey did not demonstrate a clear preference  
260 for mimicking any particular prey type. In contrast, at high poison levels (0.1 and 0.2,  
261 Figure 3c and 3d, respectively), mimic prey showed a clear preference toward mimicking  
262 poisonous prey. Thus it was only when poison efficacy was high and predators evolved to  
263 selectively avoid poisonous prey (Figure 1) that prey evolved to selectively mimic that  
264 prey type.

### 265 *Signal Noise and the Effect of Information Loss*

266 In the experiments considered above, the phenotypic appearance of mimics was  
267 perceived with perfect fidelity by the predators. I.e. predators always saw what the  
268 mimics intended them to see. In order to test the robustness of strategies for mimicking  
269 poisonous prey, we further evaluated mimicry choices by evolving populations under  
270 ‘imperfect’ mimicry conditions. Under imperfect mimicry, predators perceived the  
271 intended mimic signal only 25% of the time, with the true (mimic) phenotype apparent to  
272 the predator the rest of the time. From the final populations, we then calculated the ratio

273 of the mean proportion of organisms of each population that were mimicking poisonous  
274 prey under the low accuracy mimicry conditions to the mean proportion mimicking  
275 poisonous prey when mimicry was perfect for each of the five poison levels (0.10, 0.20,  
276 0.40, 0.75, 1.0; Figure 4). By this measure, ratios over 1.0 would indicate a greater  
277 proportion of organisms were attempting to mimic poisonous prey when mimicry was  
278 imperfect than when it was perfect. We calculated 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for  
279 these measures by repeatedly calculating the ratio from sampled subsets of the source  
280 populations (i.e. 25% and 100% accuracy populations) over 1000 iterations. At the two  
281 highest poison levels, 0.75 and 1.0, the ratios (95% CIs) were 1.28 (1.20 – 1.37) and 1.39  
282 (1.29 – 1.47), respectively. The three lower poison levels, 0.1, 0.2, and 0.4, had realized  
283 ratios of 0.71 (0.66 - 0.76), 0.83 (0.77 – 0.89), 0.81 (0.75 – 0.86), respectively. Overall,  
284 these data indicate that low proportions of organisms in the mimic class chose to mimic  
285 poisonous prey when mimicry was imperfect (i.e. most ratios fell below 1.0). However,  
286 high poison efficacy ( $\geq 0.75$ ) provided enough protection to poison prey phenotypes  
287 that a higher proportion of prey in the mimicry class had evolved to appear poisonous,  
288 even though mimicry was highly imperfect. Values above 1.0 indicate that at high poison  
289 levels a lower proportion of perfect mimics mimicked the poison model than did so under  
290 imperfect mimicry conditions. We suggest that may have arisen because, under perfect  
291 mimicry, predators should specialize only on the non-poisonous prey class due to the  
292 high cost of misidentifying the poisonous model as a mimic. This reduces selection  
293 pressures for mimics to mimic the poisonous phenotype. However, when mimicry is  
294 imperfect, the edible population of mimic prey remains more numerous and may  
295 therefore sustain predators specializing on the mimic class. Under such conditions,

296 selection will more strongly favor mimics that avoid these specialists by mimicking the  
297 poison model.

## 298 **Discussion**

299 We have demonstrated that adequate toxicity is required for aposematic cue recognition  
300 to evolve and inform predatory behavior. At low poison levels, predators distinguished  
301 between prey types in only 3 of 26 trials. However, at higher poison efficacy levels,  
302 predator recognition and selection of prey types increased, with the behavior fixing in all  
303 trial populations for poison levels at and above 0.4. This agrees with previous findings  
304 that predator learning is enhanced by highly distasteful prey [21]. At the same time,  
305 selective pressures on prey were strong enough to promote the evolution of dishonest  
306 signaling through mimicry of the aposematic signal (Figure 3). Mimics and dishonest  
307 signaling did not cause predators to ignore the aposematic cue (Figures 2). Instead, at the  
308 given prey type ‘immigration’ rates used here, mimics evolved to deceptively signal that  
309 they were poisonous without significantly destabilizing predator cue recognition (Figure  
310 3). Additionally, once predators began to cue in on and respond to prey signals, at higher  
311 poison-prey toxicity levels, higher proportions of mimics signaling that they were  
312 poisonous, leading to an increase in mimic survival relative to safe prey (Figure 2).

313 Despite being capable of mimicking poisonous species, mimics did not universally  
314 evolve to employ this strategy. Instead, as has often been observed in nature and is  
315 predicted in mathematical models [20,55,56], the ratio of expressed mimic signals  
316 appears to reach equilibrium. This occurred at all poison levels, suggesting that the  
317 toxicity of the model can only provide protection to a certain number of mimics and that  
318 this level of protection is governed by negative frequency dependence. Any non-

319 poisonous species that becomes highly abundant will experience increased selection  
320 pressure, eventually driving it into rarity while other prey species populations increase,  
321 causing an increase in predation on that species and ultimately leading to stable signaling  
322 ratios, as are apparent in Figure 3.

323 Brower's model [25] demonstrated that highly toxic prey can support an abundance of  
324 perfect mimics. Similarly, we found that the proportion of mimics signaling toxicity  
325 increased as the toxicity of the model increased. Under conditions of imperfect mimicry  
326 (Figure 4), predators increasingly generalize the signals of toxic prey as the prey's  
327 toxicity increases, because the cost of failing to identify a model as a mimic is too high  
328 [39,57], particularly in the presence of alternative prey [45]. However, our experiments  
329 also show that in environments with coevolving naïve predators, imperfect mimicry is  
330 supported without requiring high levels of toxicity. This finding lends support to Fisher's  
331 theory [4] of gradual evolution of mimicry. Our results suggest that other dishonest  
332 signals may have evolved gradually in situations where the cost of incorrectly  
333 distinguishing a dishonest from honest signal is high. Similarly, in the coral snake  
334 mimicry complex, the most perfect mimics appear at the edge of the model range [58]  
335 and high model abundance at the center supports imprecise mimicry because of predatory  
336 generalization [39]. At the same time, our findings of predator generalization and the  
337 evolution of imperfect mimicry contrast with the assertion that mimicry must evolve in a  
338 two-step process that starts with feature saltation [37,59]. Such feature saltation would  
339 allow a species to jump the adaptive valley between crypsis and mimicry, and then  
340 gradually evolve toward the adaptive peak defined by the model's appearance [33,59].  
341 Our results suggest that this two-step process is not a necessary mechanism for the

342 evolution of mimicry systems.

343 Overall, we have demonstrated that mechanisms of communication based on cue  
344 recognition readily evolve when it provides adequate benefits to both parties. Further, we  
345 have shown that these systems are robust to high levels of noise: cues, once recognized,  
346 can support the evolution of dishonest mimicry signaling, even when the mimicry signal  
347 is highly imperfect, without disrupting the communication system. Understanding how  
348 basic signaling systems evolve can help us understand the selective pressures leading to  
349 more complex communication and language systems. Our findings suggest that  
350 communicative signaling systems can evolve readily and gradually, without feature  
351 saltation, and can confer adaptive advantages allowing populations to cross adaptive  
352 valleys toward increasingly sophisticated signal-receiver communications systems.

### 353 **Acknowledgments**

354 We are grateful for the invaluable input of Chris Adami, Mike Wiesenauer, and the  
355 BEACON 2013 class. This work was supported by the BEACON Center for the Study of  
356 Evolution in Action (NSF Cooperative Agreement DBI-0939454) and the Michigan State  
357 University Institute for Cyber Enabled Research. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions  
358 or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not  
359 necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

### 360 **References**

361 1     Randall, J. E. 2005 A Review of Mimicry in Marine Fishes. **44**, 299–328.

- 362 2 Lev-Yadun, S. 2009 Müllerian and Batesian mimicry rings of white-variegated  
363 aposematic spiny and thorny plants: a hypothesis. *Israel Journal of Plant Sciences*  
364 **57**, 107–116. (doi:10.1560/IJPS.57.1)
- 365 3 Wickler, W. 1968 *Mimicy in plants and animals*. London: Wiedenfeld and  
366 Nicholson.
- 367 4 Fisher, R. A. 1930 *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Oxford: Oxford  
368 University Press.
- 369 5 Pfennig, D. W. & Kikuchi, D. W. 2012 Competition and the evolution of imperfect  
370 mimicry. **58**, 608–619.
- 371 6 Iserbyt, A., Bots, J., Van Dongen, S., Ting, J. J., Van Gossum, H. & Sherratt, T. N.  
372 2011 Frequency-dependent variation in mimetic fidelity in an intraspecific  
373 mimicry system. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* **278**, 3116–  
374 22. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.0126)
- 375 7 Ries, L. & Mullen, S. 2008 A Rare Model Limits the Distribution of Its More  
376 Common Mimic : A Twist on Frequency- Dependent Batesian Mimicry. *Evolution*  
377 **62**, 1798–1803.
- 378 8 Przeczek, K., Mueller, C. & Vamosi, S. M. 2008 The evolution of aposematism is  
379 accompanied by increased diversification. *Integrative zoology* **3**, 149–56.  
380 (doi:10.1111/j.1749-4877.2008.00091.x)

- 381 9 Joron, M. & Mallet, J. L. 1998 Diversity in mimicry: paradox or paradigm? *Trends*  
382 *in ecology & evolution* **13**, 461–6.
- 383 10 Harper, G. R. & Pfennig, D. W. 2008 Selection overrides gene flow to break down  
384 maladaptive mimicry. *Nature* **451**, 1103–1106.
- 385 11 Dawkins, R. & Krebs, J. R. 1979 Arms races between and within species.  
386 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **205**, 489–511.
- 387 12 Gavrilets, S. & Hastings, a 1998 Coevolutionary chase in two-species systems  
388 with applications to mimicry. *Journal of theoretical biology* **191**, 415–27.  
389 (doi:10.1006/jtbi.1997.0615)
- 390 13 Turner, J. R. G., Kearney, E. P. & Exton, L. S. 1984 Mimicry and the Monte Carlo  
391 predator: the palatability spectrum, and the origins of mimicry. *Biological Journal*  
392 *of the Linnean Society* **23**, 247–268. (doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1984.tb00143.x)
- 393 14 Smith, S. M. 1975 Innate recognition of coral snake pattern by a possible avian  
394 predator. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* **187**, 759–60.  
395 (doi:10.1126/science.187.4178.759)
- 396 15 Hasson, O. 1991 Pursuit-deterrent signals: communication between prey and  
397 predator. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **6**, 325–9. (doi:10.1016/0169-  
398 5347(91)90040-5)

- 399 16 Sherratt, T. N. & Beatty, C. D. 2003 The evolution of warning signals as reliable  
400 indicators of prey defense. *The American naturalist* **162**, 377–89.  
401 (doi:10.1086/378047)
- 402 17 Franks, D. W., Ruxton, G. D. & Sherratt, T. N. 2009 Warning signals evolve to  
403 disengage Batesian mimics. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution*  
404 **63**, 256–67. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00509.x)
- 405 18 Sherratt, T. N. 2002 The evolution of imperfect mimicry. *Behavioral Ecology* **13**,  
406 821–826. (doi:10.1093/beheco/13.6.821)
- 407 19 EDMUNDS, M. 2000 Why are there good and poor mimics? *Biological Journal of*  
408 *the Linnean Society* (doi:10.1006/bijl.1999.0425)
- 409 20 Holen, Ø. & Johnstone, R. 2004 The evolution of mimicry under constraints. *The*  
410 *American Naturalist* **164**, 598–613.
- 411 21 Lindstrom, L., Alatalo, R. V. & Mappes, J. 1997 Imperfect Batesian mimicry--the  
412 effects of the frequency and the distastefulness of the model. *Proceedings of the*  
413 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **264**, 149–153. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1997.0022)
- 414 22 Muller, F. 1879 Ituna and Thyridia; a remarkable case of mimicry in butterflies.  
415 *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London* , XX–XXIX.
- 416 23 Bates, H. W. 1862 Contributions to an insect fauna of the Amazon valley.  
417 Lepidoptera: Heliconiidae. *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London* **23**,  
418 495–566.

- 419 24 Mappes, J. & Alatalo, R. 1997 Batesian Mimicry and Signal Accuracy. *Evolution*  
420 **51**, 2050–2053.
- 421 25 Brower, L. P., Pough, F. H. & Meck, H. R. 1970 Theoretical investigations of  
422 automimicry, I. Single trial learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
423 *Sciences of the United States of America* **66**, 1059–66.
- 424 26 Pough, F., Brower, L., Meck, H. & Kessell, S. 1973 Theoretical investigations of  
425 automimicry: Multiple trial learning and the palatability spectrum. *Proceedings of*  
426 *the National Academy of Sciences* **70**, 2261–2265.
- 427 27 Wilson, J. S., Jahner, J. P., Williams, K. a & Forister, M. L. 2013 Ecological and  
428 evolutionary processes drive the origin and maintenance of imperfect mimicry.  
429 *PloS one* **8**, e61610. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061610)
- 430 28 Pfennig, D. W., Harper, G. R., Brumo, A. F., Harcombe, W. R. & Pfennig, K. S.  
431 2006 Population differences in predation on Batesian mimics in allopatry with  
432 their model: selection against mimics is strongest when they are common.  
433 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **61**, 505–511. (doi:10.1007/s00265-006-  
434 0278-x)
- 435 29 Aronsson, M. & Gamberale-Stille, G. 2008 Domestic chicks primarily attend to  
436 colour, not pattern, when learning an aposematic coloration. *Animal Behaviour* **75**,  
437 417–423. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.05.006)

- 438 30 Barnett, C., Bateson, M. & Rowe, C. 2007 State-dependent decision making:  
439 educated predators strategically trade off the costs and benefits of consuming  
440 aposematic prey. *Behavioral Ecology* **18**, 645–651. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arm027)
- 441 31 Brower, J. 1960 Experimental Studies of Mimicry . IV . The Reactions of Starlings  
442 to Different Proportions of Models and Mimics. *American Naturalist* **94**, 271–282.
- 443 32 Kikuchi, D. W. & Pfennig, D. W. 2010 High-model abundance may permit the  
444 gradual evolution of Batesian mimicry: an experimental test. *Proceedings of the*  
445 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **277**, 1041–8. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.2000)
- 446 33 Gamberale-Stille, G., Balogh, A. C. V, Tullberg, B. S. & Leimar, O. 2012 Feature  
447 saltation and the evolution of mimicry. *Evolution* **66**, 807–17. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-  
448 5646.2011.01482.x)
- 449 34 Balogh, A. C. V & Leimar, O. 2005 Müllerian mimicry: an examination of  
450 Fisher’s theory of gradual evolutionary change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*  
451 *B: Biological Sciences* **272**, 2269–75. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3227)
- 452 35 Emlen, J. 1968 Batesian Mimicry : A Preliminary Theoretical Investigation of  
453 Quantitative Aspects. *The American Naturalist* **102**, 235–241.
- 454 36 Estabrook, G. & Jespersen, D. 1974 Strategy for a Predator Encountering a Model-  
455 Mimic System. *American Naturalist* **108**, 443–457.
- 456 37 Franks, D. W. & Sherratt, T. N. 2007 The evolution of multicomponent mimicry.  
457 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **244**, 631–9. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2006.09.019)

- 458 38 Penney, H. D., Hassall, C., Skevington, J. H., Abbott, K. R. & Sherratt, T. N. 2012  
459 A comparative analysis of the evolution of imperfect mimicry. *Nature* **483**, 461–4.  
460 (doi:10.1038/nature10961)
- 461 39 Kikuchi, D. W. & Pfennig, D. W. 2010 Predator cognition permits imperfect coral  
462 snake mimicry. *The American naturalist* **176**, 830–4. (doi:10.1086/657041)
- 463 40 Caley, M. J. & Schluter, D. 2003 Predators favour mimicry in a tropical reef fish.  
464 *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* **270**, 667–72.  
465 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2263)
- 466 41 Huheey, J. 1964 Studies of Warning Coloration and Mimicry . IV . A .  
467 Mathematical Model of Model-Mimic Frequencies. *Ecology* **45**, 185–188.
- 468 42 Kannan, D. 1983 A Markov chain analysis of predator strategy in a model-mimic  
469 system. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **45**, 347–400.
- 470 43 Tsoularis, A. & Wallace, J. 2005 A MARKOV CHAIN MODEL OF  
471 PREDATOR-MODEL-MIMIC. *Journal of Biological Systems* **13**, 273–286.
- 472 44 Honma, A., Takakura, K. & Nishida, T. 2008 Optimal-foraging predator favors  
473 commensalistic Batesian mimicry. *PloS one* **3**, e3411.  
474 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0003411)
- 475 45 Lindström, L., Alatalo, R., Lyttinen, A. & Mappes, J. 2004 The Effect of  
476 Alternative Prey on the Dynamics of Imperfect Batesian and Müllerian Mimicries.  
477 *Evolution* **58**, 1294–1302.

- 478 46 Holmgren, N. M. a. & Enquist, M. 1999 Dynamics of mimicry evolution.  
479 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **66**, 145–158. (doi:10.1111/j.1095-  
480 8312.1999.tb01880.x)
- 481 47 Matessi, C. & Cori, R. 1972 Models of population genetics of Batesian mimicry.  
482 *Theoretical population biology* **3**, 41–68.
- 483 48 Huheey, J. 1976 Studies in Warning Coloration and Mimicry . VII . Evolutionary  
484 Consequences of a Batesian- Müllerian Spectrum : A Model for Müllerian  
485 Mimicry. *Evolution* **30**, 86–93.
- 486 49 Eisner, T., Kafatos, F. & Linsley, E. 1962 Lycid Predation by Mimetic Adult  
487 Cerambycidae ( Coleoptera ). *Evolution* **16**, 316–324.
- 488 50 Avery, M. 1985 APPLICATION OF MIMICRY THEORY TO BIRD DAMAGE  
489 CONTROL. *The Journal of wildlife management* **49**, 1116–1121.
- 490 51 Ofria, C., Bryson, D. & Wilke, C. 2009 Artificial life models in software.  
491 *Advances in Artificial Life, chapter Avida: A Software Platform for Research in*  
492 *Computational Evolutionary Biology* , 3–36.
- 493 52 Lewontin, R. C. 1970 The units of selection. *Annual Review of Ecology and*  
494 *Systematics* **1**, 1–18.
- 495 53 Fortuna, M. A., Zaman, L., Wagner, A. P. & Ofria, C. 2013 Evolving Digital  
496 Ecological Networks. **9**, 1–6. (doi:10.1371/journal.-pcbi.1002928)

- 497 54 Bryson, D. M. & Ofria, C. 2013 Understanding Evolution Potential in Virtual CPU  
498 Architectures. *arXiv:1309.0719 (2013)*
- 499 55 Huheey, J. 1988 Mathematical Models of Mimicry. *American Naturalist* **131**, S22–  
500 S41.
- 501 56 Speed, M. P. & Ruxton, G. D. 2010 Imperfect Batesian mimicry and the  
502 conspicuousness costs of mimetic resemblance. *The American naturalist* **176**, E1–  
503 14. (doi:10.1086/652990)
- 504 57 Ihalainen, E., Lindström, L. & Mappes, J. 2007 Investigating Müllerian mimicry:  
505 predator learning and variation in prey defences. *Journal of evolutionary biology*  
506 **20**, 780–91. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01234.x)
- 507 58 Harper, G. R. & Pfennig, D. W. 2007 Mimicry on the edge: why do mimics vary  
508 in resemblance to their model in different parts of their geographical range?  
509 *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* **274**, 1955–61.  
510 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0558)
- 511 59 Balogh, A. C. V., Gamberale-Stille, G., Tullberg, B. S. & Leimar, O. 2010 Feature  
512 theory and the two-step hypothesis of Müllerian mimicry evolution. *Evolution;*  
513 *international journal of organic evolution* **64**, 810–22. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-  
514 5646.2009.00852.x)

515

516 **Figure 1. Predators evolve to recognize and avoid consuming poisonous prey, even**

517 **at relatively low poison efficacy levels.** Data shown represent a fit from a logistic  
518 regression model relating poison level to the probability that predator species will evolve  
519 to avoid consuming poisonous prey (based on proportion of evolved populations in which  
520 poison prey were no longer under predation pressure). Solid black line indicates the  
521 predicted probability. The red dashed lines represent the 95% bootstrap confidence  
522 intervals of the model. Circles indicate the observed values in our experiments.

523 **Figure 2. Predators benefit from evolving to distinguish and preferentially avoid**  
524 **poisonous prey at high poison efficacy levels.** Shown are mean population size for the  
525 three prey classes, non-poisonous (blue), poisonous (pink), and mimics (orange), as well  
526 as predator abundance (grey) at the four tested poison levels, 0.025 (a), 0.05 (b), 0.1 (c),  
527 and 0.2 (d). Shaded regions show the 95% bootstrap confidence intervals calculated from  
528 10,000 iterations.

529 **Figure 3. Prey preferentially mimic poisonous prey under conditions of high poison**  
530 **efficacy and associated evolved predator selectivity.** Shown are proportion of mimic  
531 class organisms presenting phenotypes representing each available prey class: mimic  
532 (orange), non-poisonous (blue), and poisonous (pink) at the four tested poison levels,  
533 0.025 (a), 0.05 (b), 0.1 (c), and 0.2 (d). Shaded regions show the 95% bootstrap  
534 confidence intervals calculated from 10,000 iterations.


535 **Figure 4. High poison efficacy levels promote the evolution of mimicry, even when**  
536 **mimicry is highly imperfect.** Shown are mean ratios of the mean proportion of  
537 organisms in each population that were mimicking poisonous prey under low accuracy  
538 mimicry conditions (25%) to the mean proportion mimicking poisonous prey when

539 mimicry was perfect (100% accuracy). The observed ratios greater than 1.0 indicate that  
 540 selection to mimic poisonous prey was even greater at higher poison levels when  
 541 mimicry was imperfect than it was when mimicry was perfect because increased toxicity  
 542 supports imperfect mimicry. At low poison levels, a lower proportion of organisms in the  
 543 mimic class mimic poison prey when mimicry is imperfect. CI's given are 95%  
 544 bootstrapped confidence intervals. Bootstrapping was performed by repeatedly  
 545 calculating the ratio from sampled subsets of the source populations (i.e. 25% and 100%  
 546 accuracy populations) at 500,000 updates.

<b>Instruction Sequence</b>	<b>Non-poisonous</b>	<b>Mimic</b>	<b>Poisonous</b>
attack	●	●	●
attack + nop-A	●		
attack + nop-B		●	
attack + nop-C			●
attack + nop-D	●		
attack + nop-E		●	
attack + nop-F			●
attack + nop-G	●		
attack + nop-H		●	

547  
 548 **Table 1. Attack instruction sequence targeting.** The prey type targeted by each of nine  
 549 possible attack instruction sequences are shown above, indicated by the ● symbol.

Probability Predators Avoid Consuming Poisonous Prey



Poison Level

