

# Seasonal states in the evolutionary dynamics of finite populations

Olena Tkachenko,<sup>1</sup> Juzar Thingna,<sup>2</sup> Sergey Denisov,<sup>3,1</sup> Vasily Zaburdaev,<sup>4</sup> and Peter Hänggi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Sumy State University, Rîmsky-Korsakov Street 2, 40007 Sumy, Ukraine*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut für Physik, Universität Augsburg, Universitätsstraße 1, 86159 Augsburg, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Nanosystems Initiative Munich, Schellingstr. 4, D-80799 München, Germany*

<sup>4</sup>*Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems,  
Nöthnitzer Str. 38, D-01187 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: July 21, 2022)

Mating strategies of many biological species are not constant but season-dependent. In evolutionary game theory this can be modeled with two finite opposite-sex populations whose members are playing against each other following rules which are modulated in time. By combining Floquet theory and the concept of quasi-stationary distributions, we show the existence of seasonally periodic states in the stochastic evolution of the populations. These metastable states capture the evolution of long-surviving mutants, players that are using strategies different from that used by the majority of a population.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Le, 87.23.Kg, 05.45.-a

*Introduction.* The evolutionary dynamics of animal populations is tied to the reproductive activity, a complex process which involves mating competitions, courting, and parental care [1]. Within the game theory setup, the sex conflict over parental investment was formalized by Dawkins (1976) in his famous “Battle of Sexes” (BoS) [2]. An example of such a game is shown in Fig. 1. In this game, players of each sex have two alternative strategies. The payoff matrix quantifies the reward received by a player (which is using a particular strategy  $s$ ) after it has played against a member of the opposite-sex population (which is using a particular strategy  $s'$ ).

In recent years it has been found that in many species mating strategies and preferences are not constant in time but season-dependent [3]. When selecting (courting) a mate, a female (male) of the species faces a complex choice problem where benefits of a choice depend on the season and have to be traded off against each other. For example, the rate of the hormonal activity in the females of Carolina anole lizards (*Anolis carolinensis*), courtship strategies of the males, and mate selection criteria of both, are regulated by the temperature and photoperiod [4]. Even the amount of different types of muscle fibers that control the vibrations of a red throat fan (dewlap) - which males employ during courtship - is season dependent [5]. Within the BoS framework, these seasonal variations can be modeled by periodically modulating the game payoffs, see Fig. 1. It is the goal of this paper to understand how these modulations influence the game-driven dynamics of populations.

Finite size of animal populations favors a stochastic approach to the problem of evolutionary dynamics. Although the convergence to the deterministic mean-field dynamics is guaranteed in the limit of a large number of players  $N \rightarrow \infty$  [6–8], the stochastic dynamics of large but finite populations can still be very different from the mean-field deterministic evolution [9–12].




FIG. 1: (color online) ‘Battle of Sexes’ with seasonal variations. A female of Carolina anole lizards could be either *coy* (and prefer a long and arduous courtship, in order to be sure that a mate will contribute to parental care) or *fast* (and not concerned much with the parental care). A male of the species could be either *faithful* (and ready to assure a potential partner that he will be a faithful husband by performing a long courtship) or *philanderer* (and would prefer to shorten the courtship stage). Depending on the strategies,  $s$ , played by the female and  $s'$ , played by her mate, there are payoffs,  $b_{ss'}$  (to the female) and  $a_{s's}$  (to the male). Both females and males are season-constrained in their preferences of their mates, which is modeled via time-periodic modulations of the payoffs.

In this Letter, we apply the concept of quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing Markov chains [13] to a stochastic evolutionary dynamics and identify the *metastable* states. By employing the Floquet theory [14] of matrix operators, used in quantum physics [15, 16], we generalize the notion of metastable states [17–19] to periodically modulated evolutionary processes. We show

that seasonally periodic metastable states survive over extremely long (as compared to the period of modulations) timescales and demonstrate complex dynamics which is beyond the reach of the mean-field approach [24].

*Model.* We adapt the game-oriented version of the Moran processes [20], introduced in Ref. [21] and generalized to two-player games in Ref. [9]. Players  $A$  (males) and  $B$  (females) form two populations, each one of a fixed size  $N$  and with two available strategies,  $s = \{1, 2\}$ , see Fig. 1. Payoffs are specified by four functions,  $\{a_{ss'}(t)\}$  and  $\{b_{s's}(t)\}$ ,  $s, s' = \{1, 2\}$ . They are time-periodic functions,  $c_{ss'}(t) = c_{ss'}(t + T)$ ,  $c = \{a, b\}$ , and can be represented as sums of autonomous and zero-mean non-autonomous components,  $c_{ss'}(t) = \bar{c}_{ss'} + \tilde{c}_{ss'}(t)$ ,  $\langle \tilde{c}_{ss'}(t) \rangle_T = 0$ . The time starting from  $t = 0$  is incremented by  $\Delta t = T/M$  after each round. After  $M$  rounds the payoffs return to their initial values. The state of the populations after the  $m$ -th round is fully specified by the number of players playing the first strategy,  $i$  (males) and  $j$  (females),  $0 \leq i, j \leq N$ . The average payoff of the players using strategy  $s$  is

$$\pi_s^A(j, t) = a_{s1}(t) \frac{j}{N} + a_{s2}(t) \frac{(N-j)}{N}, \quad (1)$$

$$\pi_s^B(i, t) = b_{s1}(t) \frac{i}{N} + b_{s2}(t) \frac{(N-i)}{N}. \quad (2)$$

Payoffs determine the probabilities for a player to be chosen for reproduction, e.g. for the male population,

$$P_s^A(i, j, t) = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{1-w + w\pi_s^A(j, t)}{1-w + w\bar{\pi}^A(i, j, t)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{\pi}^A(i, j, t) = [i\pi_1^A(j, t) + (N-i)\pi_2^A(j, t)]/N$  is the average payoff of the males. The baseline fitness  $w \in [0, 1]$  is a tunable parameter [9, 21]. When  $w = 0$ , the probability to be chosen for reproduction does not depend on player's performance and is uniform across the population. After the choice has been made, another member of the population is chosen completely randomly and replaced with an offspring of the player chosen for reproduction, i.e. with a player using the same strategy as its parent [22]. This update mechanism is acting simultaneously in both populations,  $A$  and  $B$ , such that a mating pair produces two offspring, a male and a female, on every round. Therefore, the size of the populations  $N$  remains constant.

A single round can be considered as a one-step Markov process, with transition rates, e.g. for population  $A$ , from a state  $i$  to states  $i+1$  and  $i-1$ , are given by [9, 23]

$$\begin{aligned} T_A^+(i, j, t) &= \frac{1-w + w\pi_1^A(t)}{1-w + w\bar{\pi}^A} \frac{i}{N} \frac{N-i}{N}, \\ T_A^-(i, j, t) &= \frac{1-w + w\pi_2^A(t)}{1-w + w\bar{\pi}^A} \frac{N-i}{N} \frac{i}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

By following the approach in Ref. [9], it can be shown that in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the dynamics of the variables

$x = i/N$  and  $y = j/N$  is defined by the adjusted replicator equations [7, 24],

$$\dot{x} = [1-x][\Delta^A(t) - \Sigma^A(t)y] \frac{1}{\Gamma + \bar{\pi}^A(x, y, t)}, \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{y} = [1-y][\Delta^B(t) - \Sigma^B(t)x] \frac{1}{\Gamma + \bar{\pi}^B(x, y, t)}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\Delta^C = c_{12} - c_{22}$ ,  $\Sigma^C = c_{11} + c_{22} - c_{12} - c_{21}$ ,  $\Gamma = \frac{1-w}{w}$ , and  $C = \{A, B\}$ .

The state of the system can be expressed as a  $N \times N$  matrix  $\mathbf{p}$  with elements  $p(i, j)$ , which are the probabilities to find two populations in the states  $i$  and  $j$ , respectively. Round-to-round dynamics can be evaluated as the multiplication [25] of the state  $\mathbf{p}$  with the transition fourth-order tensor  $\mathbf{S}$ , with elements  $S(i, j, i', j')$  [3]. By using the bijection  $k = (N-1)j + i$ , we can unfold the probability matrix  $p(i, j)$  into the vector  $\tilde{p}(k)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, N^2$ , and the tensor  $S(i, j, i', j')$  into the matrix  $\tilde{S}(k, l)$ . This reduces the problem to a Markov chain [28],  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{m+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^m \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ , where  $m$  is the round to be played. The four states ( $i = \{0, N\}, j = \{0, N\}$ ) are absorbing states because the transition rates, Eqs. (4), leading out of them equal zero. The absorbing states are attractors of the evolutionary dynamics, and the finite-size fluctuations will eventually drive a population to one of them [12, 26]. This would mean the extinction of all but one phenotype such that only one strategy survives in the now *monomorphic* population [9, 12].

We are interested in the dynamics before the absorption, so we merge the four states into a single absorbing state by summing the corresponding incoming rates. The boundary states, ( $i = \{0, N\}, j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ ) and ( $i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, j = \{0, N\}$ ), can also be merged into this absorbing super-state: Once the population gets to the boundary, it will only move towards one of the two nearest absorbing states. By labeling the absorbing super-state with index  $k = 0$ , we end up with a  $(L+1) \times (L+1)$  matrix

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^m = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \boldsymbol{\varrho}_0^m \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^m \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where  $L = (N-1)^2$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\varrho}_0^m$  is a vector of the incoming transition probabilities of the absorbing super-state,  $\mathbf{0}$  is a  $L \times 1$  zero vector, and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^m$  is a  $L \times L$  reduced transition matrix.

With Eq. (7), we arrive at the setup used by Darroch and Seneta to formulate their concept of *quasi-stationary distributions* [13]. There exists a vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$  with the maximal mean absorption time. This state is the most resistant to the wash-out by the finite-size fluctuations and it remains near invariant under the action of the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^m$ .  $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$  is the normalized right eigenvector of the reduced transition matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^m$  with the maximum eigenvalue  $\lambda$  [27]. By using the inverse bijection, we can transform




FIG. 2: (color online) Metastable states of the Battle of Sexes with stationary payoffs. In the mean-field limit  $N = \infty$ , a trajectory spirals towards a fixed point  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ , the Nash equilibrium of the game. The metastable states are specified by their quasi-stationary probability density functions (pdf's) (3d plots). Although, for any  $N$ , the mean position  $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t))$  coincide with the Nash equilibrium, the stochastic evolution is governed by the metastable limit cycles located on the crater ridge on the pdf's tops. For  $N = 200$  the pdf combines the results of the direct diagonalization (left half of the pdf, this procedure was also used to obtain the function for  $N = 100$ ) and of the preconditioned stochastic sampling (right part of the pdf, this procedure was also used to obtain the function for  $N = 400$ ) [3]. The baseline fitness  $w = 0.3$  (other parameters are given in the text).

vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$  into a two-dimensional probability density function (pdf)  $\mathbf{d}$ .

*Stationary case.* As an example, we consider a game with payoffs  $a_{11}$ ,  $a_{22}$ ,  $b_{12}$  and  $b_{21}$  equal 1, and payoffs  $-1$  for the rest of strategies (this choice corresponds to the ‘‘Matching Pennies’’ game [29]). Figure 2 presents the numerically obtained metastable states of the game. We use two methods, the direct diagonalization of the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  (which is stationary in this case) and massive preconditioned stochastic sampling [3]. For  $N = 200$  we find a perfect agreement between the results of the two methods.

The means,

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N-1} \frac{i}{N} \cdot d(i, j); \quad \bar{y} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N-1} \frac{j}{N} \cdot d(i, j), \quad (8)$$

coincide with the Nash equilibrium [30] for any  $N$ . However, the actual stochastic dynamics is governed by the metastable limit cycle encircling the equilibrium (this could be seen by performing short-run stochastic simulations), see crater ridges on the tops of pdf's shown in Fig. 2. It can be interpreted as a stochastic Hopf bifurcation [31] within the Langevin-oriented approach to the dynamics of finite populations [9, 23]. In the mean-field limit the cycle collapses into the Nash equilibrium. Note, however, that convergence to this limit is slow, as indicated by the width of the pdf for  $N = 400$ .

*Case of modulated payoffs.* By adding time-modulations to the model, we find that the mean-field dynamics, Eq. (6), does not exhibit substantial changes even under relatively large modulations. For the choice  $\epsilon(t) = \tilde{a}_{11}(t) = \tilde{b}_{22}(t) = f \cos(\omega t)$  with  $\omega = 2\pi/T$ , and all other payoffs held stationary, there is a period-one limit cycle localized near the Nash equilibrium of the stationary case, see Figs. 3(a,b). It shrinks to a set of adiabatic Nash equilibria,  $\left\{ x_{NE}(\epsilon) = \frac{2-\epsilon}{4-\epsilon}, y_{NE}(\epsilon) = \frac{2}{4+\epsilon} \right\}$  in

the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .

The dynamics of a finite  $N$  population is different. The corresponding stochastic evolution, when initiated not too close to the absorbing boundary, can be divided into two stages. At first the trajectory in  $(i, j)$ -space relaxes towards a metastable attractor. The timescale of this process is defined by the mixing time  $t_{\text{mix}}(N)$  [32], which, however, has to be calculated for the quasi-stationary pdf now. Then the trajectory wiggles around the attractor until the fluctuations drive it to the absorbing boundary. The mean absorption time  $t_{\text{abs}}(N)$ , called ‘‘mean fixation time’’ [2, 24] in the evolutionary context, should scale faster than the mixing time, simply because the metastable state transforms into a stable one in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The lifetime of the metastable state is restricted to the time interval  $[t_{\text{mix}}(N), t_{\text{abs}}(N)]$ , whose length scales as  $t_{\text{abs}}(N)[1 - t_{\text{mix}}(N)/t_{\text{abs}}(N)] \sim t_{\text{abs}}(N)$ .

For  $\omega = 0.1$ , the stochastic simulations reveal a metastable attractor in the form of a de-localized period-two cycle, different from the period-one limit cycle of the mean-field dynamics, see Fig. 3b. Thus there is a contrast between the evolution of means described by the adjusted replicator equations and the results of the stochastic simulations. This can be resolved by using the concept of quasi-stationary distribution. Namely, the transition matrices, Eq. (7), are round-specific now and form a set  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^m\}$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, M$  (recall that after  $M = T/\Delta t$  rounds the periodically modulated payoffs return to their initial value). The propagator over the interval  $[0, t]$ ,  $0 < t < T$ , is the product  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}(t) = \prod_{m'=1}^{M_t} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{m'}$  with  $M_t = t/\Delta t$ . All the propagators, including the period-one propagator  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}(T)$ , have the same structure as the supermatrix in Eq. (7). We define the metastable attractor  $\mathbf{d}(T)$  as the quasi-stationary distribution of  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}(T)$ . It is also a *Floquet* state [15] of the reduced propagator  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^r(T)$ , which could be obtained by replacing the transition matrices  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{m'}$  with the matrices  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{m'}$  in the




FIG. 3: (color online) Evolutionary dynamics by the Battle of Sexes with modulated payoffs. (a) Period-one limit cycles of the mean-field dynamics for  $\omega = 0.1$  (dash-dotted line) and  $\omega = 0.01$  (solid line) are localized near the Nash equilibrium of the stationary game,  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  (arrows indicate the direction of the motion). In the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , the mean-field attractor shrinks to the set of adiabatic Nash equilibria (dashed black line). Mean position ( $\bullet$ ) of a finite- $N$  metastable Floquet state,  $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t))$ , Eq. (8), moves along the limit cycle localized near the point  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  (means are plotted at the instants  $t_n = nT/5$ ,  $n = 0, \dots, 4$ ); (b) A stochastic trajectory (line) reveals the existence of a period-two limit cycle [the period doubling can be resolved with stroboscopic points, plotted at the instants  $2nT$  ( $\Delta$ ) and  $(2n+1)T$  ( $\diamond$ )]. The trajectory is initiated at the point marked with open square and ends up at the absorbing state (cross at the upper left corner). The parameters are  $f = 0.5$ ,  $N = 200$ , and  $M = T/\Delta t = 10N$  (corresponds to the driving frequency  $\omega = 0.1$  in the mean-field limit) [34]. Other parameters as in Fig. 2.

above definition of the propagator [or by simply cutting out the first line and first column from the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}(T)$ ]. It is, therefore, a time-periodic state,  $\mathbf{d}(t+T) = \mathbf{d}(t)$ , which changes during one period of modulations, see Fig. 4a. The metastable state  $\mathbf{d}(t)$  at any instant of time  $t$ ,  $0 < t < T$ , can be found by acting on the state  $\mathbf{d}(0)$  with the reduced propagator  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^r(t)$ .

The dynamics of the metastable state is consistent with both the mean-field and stochastic results. The evolution of the means,  $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t))$ , is close to the period-one limit cycle, see blue dots on Fig. 3a, whereas the dynamics of the whole distribution  $\mathbf{d}(t)$ , Fig. 4a, is in agreement with the finite- $N$  dynamics. The Floquet state consists of two opposite peaks produced by the noised period-two limit cycle (compare also the positions of the stroboscopic points in Fig. 3b with the pdf for  $t = 0$  in Fig. 4a). The peak contributions balance each other thus reducing the dynamics of the means to the vicinity of the point  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ .

The lifetime of the state  $\mathbf{d}(t)$  can be estimated with the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda_T$ ,  $0 < \lambda_T < 1$ , of the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^r(T)$ . In order to compare it with lifetimes of stationary metastable states, we introduce the mean single-round exponent,  $\bar{\lambda}_T = \lambda_T^{1/M}$  and define the mean lifetime as  $t_{\text{life}} = 1/(1 - \bar{\lambda}_T)$ . Figure 4b shows the dependence of  $t_{\text{life}}$  on the strength of modulations. Aside of the slow




FIG. 4: (color online) (a) Evolution of the metastable Floquet state over one period of modulations. The pdfs obtained by the direct diagonalization of the reduced period-one propagator for  $N = 200$ . The corresponding means  $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t))$  are shown on Fig. 3a ( $\bullet$ ). Plots for  $t = 0$  (top left part) and  $T$  (bottom right part) also present the results of the preconditioned stochastic sampling; (b) The lifetime  $t_{\text{life}}$  as a function of the modulation strength  $f$ , for the population size  $N = 50$  ( $\circ$ ),  $100$  ( $\square$ ), and  $200$  ( $\triangle$ ). Other parameters are as in Fig. 2.

decay trend, the effect of modulations is not large. This is in stark contrast to the dynamics of the metastable states. Namely, while in the stationary limit the pdf  $\mathbf{d}$  is localized near the Nash equilibrium, at the maximal distance from the absorbing boundaries, the metastable Floquet state is localized *near* the absorbing boundary, see Fig. 4a. We detect the increase of the boundary localization with the increase of  $N$ . This can be interpreted as the presence of long-surviving fractions of “mutants” [24], i. e. the players that are using strategies different from that used by a monomorphic majority of the populations. The evolution of the mutant fraction looks like a repeating sequence of population bottlenecks [2, 35], yet this only weakly affects the lifetime of the fraction. The relations between the exponent  $\lambda_T$ , mean absorption (fixation) time [33], and local dynamical properties of a metastable Floquet state is a challenging issue. It can be explored, for example, with a discrete-time generalization of the “optimal path to extinction” approach [36–38].

*Conclusions.* We presented a concept of seasonal states of game-driven populations when the game payoffs are periodically modulated in time. The idea that Floquet formalism can be used to gain insight into the evolution

of ecological systems subjected to periodic environments, has been recently emphasized in Refs. [39]. Here we combined the formalism with the idea of quasi-stationary distributions in Markov chains to prove the existence of metastable time-periodic states. The proposed concept is not only relevant in the context of peculiar ecological effects but applies to a broad class of periodically modulated finite systems with stochastic event-driven dynamics. Metastable Floquet states may underlay a gene-expression dynamics in a single cell, when the reactional kinetics is locked by a circadian rhythm [40], and could help to understand the Bose-Einstein condensation in a periodically modulated ensemble of cold atoms [41].

S. D. and P. H. acknowledge support by the German Excellence Initiative “Nanosystems Initiative Munich”.

- 
- [1] M. Andersson, *Sexual Selection* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1994).
- [2] R. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1976).
- [3] See Supplemental Material for more information.
- [4] D. Crews, *Science* **189**, 1059 (1975).
- [5] M. M. Holmes, C. L. Bartrem, and J. Wade, *Physiol. and Behav.* **91**, 601 (2007).
- [6] J. Hofbauer, *Imitation dynamics for games* (preprint, 1995).
- [7] J. Hofbauer and K. H. Schlag, *J. of Evol. Economics* **10**, 523 (2000).
- [8] K. H. Schlag, *J. of Econom. Theory* **78**, 130.
- [9] A. Traulsen, J. C. Claussen, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 238701 (2005).
- [10] Ch. S. Gokhale and A. Traulsen, *Dyn. Games and Appl.* **4**, 468 (2014).
- [11] A. Traulsen, J. C. Claussen, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 011901 (2006).
- [12] A. Dobrinevski and E. Frey, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 051903 (2012).
- [13] J. N. Darroch and E. Seneta, *J. Appl. Prob.* **2**, 88 (1965).
- [14] G. Floquet, *Annales de l’École Normale Supérieure* **12**, 47 (1883).
- [15] M. Grifoni and P. Hänggi, *Phys. Rep.* **304**, 229 (1998).
- [16] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf, and C. Gogolin, *Nature Phys.* **11**, 124 (2015).
- [17] G. Biroli and J. Kurchan, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016101 (2001).
- [18] S. Rulands, T. Reichenbach, and E. Frey, *J. Stat. Mech.* L01003 (2011).
- [19] M. Assaf and M. Mobilia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 188701 (2012).
- [20] P. A. P. Moran, *The Statistical Processes of Evolutionary Theory* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1962).
- [21] M. A. Nowak, A. Sasaki, C. Taylor, and D. Fudenberg, *Nature* **428**, 646 (2004).
- [22] These two consecutive steps, death and birth, can be reinterpreted as a single step of *imitation*, i.e. adoption of the strategy of the first player by the second one.
- [23] A. Traulsen, J. C. Claussen, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 041901 (2012).
- [24] J. M. Smith, *Evolution and the Theory of Games* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
- [25] We follow the “physical” convention that the stochastic matrix acts on the probability column vector to the right.
- [26] M. Khasin and M. I. Dykman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 068101 (2009).
- [27] By virtue of the Perron-Frobenius theorem,  $\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$  are both real and non-negative [28].
- [28] E. Seneta, *Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains* (Springer, NY, 2006).
- [29] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1944).
- [30] J. Nash, *PNAS* **36**, 48 (1950).
- [31] L. Arnold, *Random Dynamical Systems* (Springer, NY, 2003).
- [32] A. J. Black, A. Traulsen, and T. Galla, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 028101 (2012).
- [33] It is noteworthy that the average absorption time for a specific initial state,  $t_{\text{abs}}(i, j)$ , is proportional the corresponding entry in the left maximal-eigenvalue eigenvector of the reduced matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ . The proportionality coefficient can be found from the dual orthonormality condition.
- [34] We find a sharp contrast between the mean-filed dynamics and the stochastic evolution for this particular choice of  $M$ . For other driving scheme and/or other choice of the game payoffs, the ‘optimal’ value for the period of modulations would be different.
- [35] T. Maruyama and P. A. Fuerst, *Genetics* **111**, 691 (1985).
- [36] M. I. Dykman, E. Mori, J. Ross, and P. M. Hunt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **100**, 5735 (1994).
- [37] C. Escudero and J. A. Rodriguez, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 011130 (2008).
- [38] M. Assaf, A. Kamenev, and B. Meerson, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 041123 (2008).
- [39] C. A. Klausmeier, *Theor. Ecol.* **1**, 153 (2008); C. T. Kremer and C. A. Klausmeier, *J. Theor. Biol.* **339**, 14 (2013).
- [40] S. S. Golden, V. M. Cassone, and A. Li Wang, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **14**, 362 (2007); A. Sancar, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **15**, 23 (2008).
- [41] J. Knebel, M. F. Weber, T. Krüger, and E. Frey, *Nature Comm.* **6**, 6977 (2015).