A note on the complexity of evolutionary dynamics in a classic consumer-resource model

Iaroslav Ispolatov* & Michael Doebeli**

* Departamento de Fisica, Universidad de Santiago de Chile

Casilla 302, Correo 2, Santiago, Chile; jaros007@gmail.com

** Departments of Zoology and Mathematics, University of British Columbia,

6270 University Boulevard, Vancouver B.C. Canada, V6T 1Z4; doebeli@zoology.ubc.ca

November 5, 2018

RH: Consumer-resource dynamics

Corresponding author: Michael Doebeli, Department of Zoology and Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, 6270 University Boulevard, Vancouver B.C. Canada, V6T 1Z4, Email: doebeli@zoology.ubc.ca.

Abstract

We study how the complexity of evolutionary dynamics in the classic MacArthur consumerresource model depends on resource uptake and utilization rates. The traditional assumption in such models is that the utilization rate of the consumer is proportional to the uptake rate. More generally, we show that if these two rates are related through a power law (which includes the traditional assumption as a special case), then the resulting evolutionary dynamics in the consumer is necessarily a simple hill-climbing process leading to an evolutionary equilibrium, regardless of the dimension of phenotype space. When utilization and uptake rates are not related by a power law, more complex evolutionary trajectories can occur, including the chaotic dynamics observed in previous studies for high-dimensional phenotype spaces. These results draw attention to the importance of distinguishing between utilization and uptake rates in consumer-resource models.

Keywords: Consumer-resource models — Adaptive dynamics — gradient dynamics — chaos

1 Introduction

Adaptive dynamics (Dieckmann and Law, 1996, Geritz et al., 1998, Metz et al., 1992) has emerged as a useful framework to study long-term evolution as a dynamical system in phenotype space. Many interesting evolutionary phenomena have been studied using this framework, such as adaptive diversification and speciation (e.g. Dieckmann and Doebeli (1999), Dieckmann et al. (2004), Doebeli (2011)), the evolution of cooperation (Doebeli et al., 2004), evolutionary suicide (Gyllenberg and Parvinen, 2001), and predator-prey arms races (Dercole et al., 2006, Dieckmann et al., 1995, Doebeli and Dieckmann, 2000). The framework is in principle designed to study evolution in high-dimensional phenotype spaces (Leimar, 2009), but this line of research has only been taken up rather recently (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2014, 2010, Geritz et al., 2016, Ispolatov et al., 2016, Ito and Dieckmann, 2014, Rego-Costa et al., 2017, Svardal et al., 2014). In Doebeli and Ispolatov (2014), we have used a classical logistic competition model to argue that evolutionary dynamics tend to be complicated and chaotic in high-dimensional phenotype spaces. The competition model was based on heuristic assumptions about the form of the carrying capacity as a functions of phenotype, as well as about the form of the competition kernel as a function of the phenotypes of competing individuals. It is known that even in its simplest form, this competition model cannot be derived from an underlying consumer-resource model (Ackermann and Doebeli, 2004). It is therefore interesting to see what kind of evolutionary dynamics occur when the dynamics of the resource that mediates competition is taken into account.

The MacArthur model (MacArthur and Levins, 1967) is a classic consumer-resource model that has been used in numerous evolutionary studies (e.g. Ackermann and Doebeli (2004), Case (1981), Roughgarden (1979), Slatkin (1980), Svardal et al. (2014)). It was initially used to study the ecological dynamics of competition for a finite number of distinct resources. It can be extended to a continuous distribution of resources whose use is determined by a multi-dimensional trait (Svardal et al., 2014). Here we use this extended model to study the long-term dynamics of multi-dimensional traits determining resource use. Besides the distribution of resources, there are two crucial quantities in these models. The first is a function that describes the rate of ac-

quisition of different types of resources as a function of phenotype, and the second is a function that describes the rate of offspring production of a given phenotype as a function of the resource type consumed. In most models (in fact, in all previous models known to us), these functions are assumed to be essentially the same. Specifically, the rate of offspring production is simply proportional to the rate of consumption of a particular type of resource. However, biologically this is a rather special case, as it can easily be imagined that the type of resource that is most accessible (i.e., consumed at high rates) is not the type of resource that is most effectively converted into offspring. Here we show that with the traditional assumption of proportionality between the two functions, evolutionary dynamics of the multi-dimensional phenotype is always an equilibrium process. However, the complex dynamics of logistic competition models (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2014) can be recovered once this assumption is dropped. Thus, complicated dynamics are also prevalent in adaptive dynamics models that are based on explicit consumer-resource models. Our results show that it is crucial to carefully examine the assumptions made in such models, and in particular to make a clear a priori distinction between the rate of resource uptake and the rate at which a given resource is converted into offspring.

2 Consumer-resource dynamics

The consumer-resource system originally proposed by MacArthur for a finite number of distinct resources (MacArthur and Levins, 1967) can be generalized to a continuous spectrum of resources by assuming that different resource types are characterized by a generally multi-dimensional vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (Svardal et al., 2014). Similarly, consumers are described by a multidimensional vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We let R(z) denote the density of resource type z, and C(x) denote the density of consumer type x. The rate at which resource z is consumed by consumer x is given by a function $\phi(x, z)$. The ecological dynamics of R(z) is then described by a logistic equation with intrinsic growth rate equal to 1 (without loss of generality) and a carrying capacity K(z), plus a decay term describing resource consumption:

$$\frac{\partial R(z,t)}{\partial t} = R(z) \left(1 - \frac{R(z)}{K(z)} - \int \phi(x,z)C(x)dx \right).$$
(1)

The integral in the consumption term reflects total consumption of resource z by different consumer types x.

The dynamics of the consumer population, which is assumed to reproduce clonally, is determined by a birth term that incorporates the rate at which consumption of resource z is converted into offspring of consumer type x. This rate is given by a function $\psi(x, z)$, which is in general different from the consumption rate $\phi(x, z)$, reflecting the fact that the utility of a given resource is in general not solely determined by the rate of uptake of that resource. Note that all previous models of this this type are based on the assumption that $\psi(x, z)$ is proportional to $\phi(x, z)$.

Assuming a constant per capita death rate δ for consumers, the ecological dynamics of consumer x in the generalized MacArthur model is

$$\frac{\partial C(x,t)}{\partial t} = C(x) \left(\int \psi(x,z) R(z) dz - \delta \right).$$
(2)

To analyze the evolutionary dynamics of the consumer type x, we make the assumption that the resource dynamics is much faster than typical changes in the consumer density, an assumption that is routinely made in these kinds of models. Thus, the resource concentration is considered to be completely relaxed to its steady state

$$R^*[C(.),z] = K(z)\left(1 - \int \phi(x,z)C(x)dx\right),\tag{3}$$

(where the notation C(.) indicates that the resource steady state is a function of the current consumer distribution). Then the consumer dynamics becomes

$$\frac{\partial C(x,t)}{\partial t} = C(x) \left[\int \psi(x,z) K(z) dz - \delta - \int C(x') \int K(z) \psi(x,z) \phi(x',z) dz dx' \right].$$
(4)

If we assume that the consumer is monomorphic for a given type x (i.e., all consumer individuals have the same type x, which technically corresponds to assuming that the consumer distribution is a delta function centered at x), we obtain the equilibrium density of this monomorphic consumer, $C^*(x)$, by setting the right hand side of (4) to 0:

$$C^*(x) = \frac{\int K(z)\psi(x,z)dz - \delta}{\int K(z)\psi(x,z)\phi(x,z)dz}.$$
(5)

3 Adaptive dynamics

Following the standard adaptive dynamics procedure (Geritz et al., 1998), we consider a monomorphic consumer resident x and determine the invasion fitness f(x, y) of a rare mutant consumer y. The invasion fitness f(x, y) is the per capita growth rate of the rare mutant y in the monomorphic resident population at its ecological equilibrium $C^*(x)$:

$$f(x,y) = \int \psi(y,z)K(z)dz - \delta - C^*(x) \int K(z)\psi(y,z)\phi(x,z)dz,$$
(6)

where $C^*(x)$ is given by (5).

Assuming for simplicity that the mutational variance-covariance matrix is the identity matrix (Leimar, 2009), the adaptive dynamics of the trait x is determined by the selection gradient $s(x) = \nabla_y f(y, x)|_{y=x}$:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = s(x),\tag{7}$$

where

$$s(x) = \nabla_y f(y, x)|_{y=x}$$

$$= \left[\int K(z)\psi(x, z)dz - \delta \right] \times$$

$$\left\{ \nabla_x \ln \left| \int K(z)\psi(x, z)dz - \delta \right| - \nabla_y \ln \left[\int K(z)\psi(y, z)\phi(x, z)dz \right] \right|_{y=x} \right\}.$$
(8)

It is important to note that despite the name, the selection gradient is in general not a gradient of some function $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ on phenotype space (the selection gradient is only a gradient with respect to the mutant trait y, evaluated at the resident x). It is possible to give precise conditions in terms of the invasion fitness functions f(x, y) for the selection gradient $s(x) = \nabla_y f(y, x)|_{y=x}$ to be the gradient of some function on phenotype space (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2013). Here we can see directly that the selection gradient is a gradient of a function if we assume that the resource utilization rate $\psi(x, z)$ and uptake rate $\phi(x, z)$ functions are functionally related through a power law:

$$\phi(x,z) = A\psi^{\alpha}(x,z). \tag{9}$$

This includes of course the case where the two rates are proportional. Under this power law assumption, the selection gradient is reduced to an actual gradient form:

$$s(x) = \left[\int K(z)\psi(x,z)dz - \delta\right] \times$$

$$\nabla_x \left\{ \ln \left| \int K(z)\psi(x,z)dz - \delta \right| - \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \ln \left[\int K(z)\psi^{\alpha+1}(x,z) dz \right] \right\}.$$
(10)

Because the selection gradient is in fact a gradient in phenotype space under these assumptions, the evolutionary dynamics (7) are a simple hill-coming process which equilibrates when the

phenotype x of the evolving consumer x reaches the maximum of the function

$$\frac{\left[\int K(z)\psi(x,z)dz - \delta\right]^{\alpha+1}}{\int K(z)\psi^{\alpha+1}(x,z)dz}.$$
(11)

In particular, with the traditional assumption that the rates ψ and ϕ are proportional, the single species evolutionary dynamics generated by the consumer-resource model are always equilibrium dynamics. We note that after reaching this equilibrium, adaptive diversification in the form of evolutionary branching into coexisting phenotypic species may or may not occur (Ackermann and Doebeli, 2004, Geritz et al., 2016, Svardal et al., 2014). In fact, such diversification becomes more likely with increasing dimension of phenotype space (Débarre et al., 2014, Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2014, Svardal et al., 2014). However, here we are not focussing on the problem of diversification, but rather on the evolutionary dynamics of single species, which always converge to an equilibrium under the above assumptions.

In fact, the assumption of a power law relationship between the uptake and utilization rates is also necessary for generating an evolutionary hill-climbing process. This can be seen by examining the second gradient on the right hand side of (8). For this gradient in y, evaluated at y = x, to be a gradient in x, the following relationship must hold

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left\{\psi(x,z)\phi(x,z)\right\} = c\frac{\partial\psi(x,z)}{\partial x}\phi(x,z),\tag{12}$$

where c is some constant. Dividing by $\psi(x, z)\phi(x, z)$ yields $\frac{\partial\{\psi(x,z)\phi(x,z)\}}{\partial x}/[\psi(x, z)\phi(x, z)] = c\frac{\partial\psi(x,z)}{\partial x}/\psi(x, z)$, and integrating both sides then yields $\ln[\psi(x, z)\phi(x, z)] + D = c\ln(\psi(x, z))$ for some constant of integration D, and hence the power law relationship between ϕ and ψ .

4 Multiple resources

It is worth noting that the above conclusions remain valid if a number of resource distributions $R_r(z_r)$ are available for consumption, as long as the total consumption is a linear combination

of the consumption on each separate resource distribution. For example, if resource utilization is simply additive, the selection gradient generated in the consumer trait x as a result of consuming multiple resources becomes, in analogy to eq. (8):

$$s(x) = \left[\sum_{r} \int K_r(z_r)\psi_r(x, z_r)dz_r - \delta\right] \times$$
(13)

$$\left\{ \nabla_x \ln \left| \sum_r \int K_r(z_r) \psi_r(x, z_r) dz_r - \delta \right| - \nabla_y \ln \left[\sum_r \int K_r(z_r) \psi_r(y, z_r) \phi_r(x, z_r) dz_r \right] \right|_{y=x} \right\}$$

where r indicates the different resource distributions $R_r(z_r)$, $z_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r}$. It is easy to see that the selection gradient (13) is a gradient in the phenotype x if 1) there is a power law relationship $\phi_r(x, z_r) \propto \psi_r(x, z_r)^{\alpha_r}$ between the uptake rates $\phi_r(x, z_r)$ and the utilization rates $\psi_r(x, z_r)$ for each resource $R_r(z_r)$, and 2) the scaling exponent $\alpha_r = \alpha$ is the same for all r. The second condition is needed so that the second term on the right hand side of the single-resource gradient (10) generalizes to multiple resources (i.e., the condition is needed for the factor $1/(\alpha + 1)$ in the second term on the right hand side of the single-resource gradient (10) to be the same for all resources). In particular, if the traditional assumption of $\psi_r(x, z_r) \propto \phi_r(x, z_r)$ holds for each resource distribution $R_r(z_r)$, then the resulting adaptive dynamics always converge to an equilibrium (which may or may not be evolutionarily stable).

5 Complicated evolutionary dynamics

If the two utilization and uptake rate functions $\psi(x, z)$ and $\phi(x, z)$ are not constrained by a power law relation, the selection gradient (8) can give rise to much richer class of evolutionary dynamics. To see this, we will show below that the selection gradient can then take the general form used in Doebeli and Ispolatov (2014), giving rise to adaptive dynamics of the form:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^d b_{ij} x_j - x_i^3,$$
(14)

where the x_i are the components of the phenotype vector x. In Doebeli and Ispolatov (2014), we have shown that such adaptive dynamics are likely to be chaotic when the dimension d of phenotype space is large.

Assuming that the dimension of phenotype space d is larger than the dimension of resource space n (i.e., than the dimension of the vector z in (1)), the selection gradient on the right hand side of (14) can be generated in the consumer-resource model with the following choices of $\psi(y, z)$ and $\phi(x, z)$:

$$\psi(x,z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi\Pi_{i=1}^{d}x_{i}^{2})}} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{z_{i}^{2}}{2x_{i}^{2}}\right) F(z_{d+1},\dots,z_{n})$$

$$\phi(x,z) = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}z_{i}\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}-x_{i}^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{d}b_{ij}x_{j}}\right) G(z_{d+1},\dots,z_{n})/(\delta-1)$$

$$K(z) = \delta + 1.$$
(15)

(Note that the expression for ϕ is only defined if the argument under the square root is > 0.) The two functions F and G in d - n variables are only restricted by the normalization conditions

$$\int F(z_{d+1}, \dots, z_n) dz_{d+1}, \dots, dz_n = 1,$$

$$\int F(z_{d+1}, \dots, z_n) G(z_{d+1}, \dots, z_n) dz_{d+1}, \dots, dz_n = 1.$$
(16)

Since the function ψ is normalized,

$$\int K(z)\psi(x,z)dz = \delta + 1,$$
(17)

the common multiplier in the selection gradient (8) becomes one, and the first gradient term $(\nabla_x \dots)$ on the right hand side of (8) is zero. The argument of the second gradient term $(\nabla_y \dots)$

on the right hand side of (8) is a Gaussian integral,

$$\int K(z)\psi(x,z)\phi(x,z)dz = \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^{d} y_i^2 \left(x_i^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{d} b_{ij}x_j/x_i\right)/2\right].$$
(18)

Taking the logarithm and the gradient with respect to y and evaluating at the resident x yields the right hand side of (14) for the *i*th component of the selection gradient.

6 Conclusions

Logistic competition models have long been used to study evolution of traits influencing competitive interactions (Roughgarden, 1979). However, such models are usually based on phenomenologically plausible assumptions about the functional form of interactions between different phenotypes, rather than on a mechanistic derivation of these functional forms following from how different phenotypes affect the ecological dynamics of a common resource. In fact, it has been noticed that the usual assumption of Gaussian forms for the functions describing interactions in logistic competition models is in general not compatible with explicit consumer-resource models (Abrams, 1986, Ackermann and Doebeli, 2004, Taper and Case, 1985). In view of recent results regarding the occurrence of complex evolutionary dynamics in logistic competition models (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2014, Rego-Costa et al., 2017), it is therefore interesting to see whether such dynamics can also be observed in consumer-resource models.

In such models, there is a range of resources that are used differently by distinct phenotypes. Here we considered generalized MacArthur models (MacArthur and Levins, 1967) in which both resource distributions and consumer phenotypes are multivariate. In principle, resource use by a consumer consists of two different biological processes: resource uptake, and resource utilization, i.e., conversion of resources into offspring. In the consumer-resource models, these processes occur at rates $\phi(x, z)$ and $\psi(x, z)$, where x is the consumer phenotype and z is the resource type (both of which are generally multi-dimensional). The traditional assumption is that $\psi(x, z) \propto \phi(x, z)$, i.e., that utilization of a given resource type z by a consumer of phenotype x is proportional to the uptake of resource type z by consumer type x, with the constant of proportionality independent of x and z. However, biologically it may well be that a particular resource is easier to take up but less useful for producing energy (and offspring) than another type of resource that may be harder to acquire but may be more nutritious. Therefore, it is biologically reasonable to consider general consumer-resource models in which the uptake and utilization rates are not proportional.

Using the framework of adaptive dynamics, we found that the assumption of proportionality between uptake and utilization rates places severe restrictions on the type of evolutionary dynamics that are generated by competition for resources. In fact, assuming that these rates are related by a power law, $\phi(x, z) \propto \psi(x, z)^{\alpha}$, the evolutionary dynamics are always a simple gradient process and therefore converge to an equilibrium of the adaptive dynamics. However, if these rates are not related through a power law, then we can recover the complicated evolutionary dynamics reported in Doebeli and Ispolatov (2014), who showed that chaotic evolutionary dynamics are common if the dimension of phenotype space is large. A general biological interpretation of these results is as follows. In models with explicit resource dynamics, the ecological interaction between different consumer types is mediated by consumption of the resource and conversion of the resource into offspring, and the mechanisms underlying the ecological interactions are subsumed in the consumption rates ϕ and the utilization rates ψ . For the resulting evolutionary dynamics of consumer types to be complicated, the ecological interactions mediated by resource use need to be complicated enough, which requires that the functions ϕ and ψ are sufficiently different from each other, so that the relationship between consumption and utilization is sufficiently complicated. Here we have only provided a proof of principle of these ideas, and we have not attempted to give a specific biological interpretation of the type of rate functions needed to produce complex evolutionary dynamics. Nevertheless, our results show that it is important in principle to make the biological distinction between uptake and utilization rates in consumer resource models. While the traditional assumption that these rates are proportional always generates equilibrium dynamics, complex evolutionary dynamics can occur in consumer-resource

models if the difference between uptake and utilization rates is pronounced enough.

Acknowledgments: I. I. was supported by FONDECYT (Chile) grant 1151524. M. D. was supported by NSERC (Canada).

References

- Abrams, P., 1986. Character displacement and niche shift analyzed us- ing consumer-resource models of competition. Theoretical Population Biology 29:107–160.
- Ackermann, M. and M. Doebeli, 2004. Evolution of niche width and adaptive diversification. Evolution 58:2599–2612.
- Case, T., 1981. Niche packing and coevolution in competition communities. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 78:5021–5025.
- Débarre, F., S. L. Nuismer, and M. Doebeli, 2014. Multidimensional (Co)Evolutionary Stability. The American Naturalist 184:158–171. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/677137.
- Dercole, F., R. Ferrière, A. Gragnani, and S. Rinaldi, 2006. Coevolution of slow-fast populations: evolutionary sliding, evolutionary pseudo-equilibria and complex red queen dynamics. Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B 273:983–990.
- Dieckmann, U. and M. Doebeli, 1999. On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. Nature 400:354–357.
- Dieckmann, U., M. Doebeli, J. A. J. Metz, and D. Tautz (eds.) 2004. Adaptive Speciation. Cambridge Studies in Adaptive Dynamics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dieckmann, U. and R. Law, 1996. The dynamical theory of coevolution: A derivation from stochastic ecological processes. Journal of Mathematical Biology 34:579–612.
- Dieckmann, U., P. Marrow, and R. Law, 1995. Evolutionary cycling in predator-prey interactionspopulation-dynamics and the red queen. Journal of Theoretical Biology 176:91–102.
- Doebeli, M., 2011. Adaptive diversification. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Doebeli, M. and U. Dieckmann, 2000. Evolutionary branching and sympatric speciation caused by different types of ecological interactions. American Naturalist 156:S77–S101.

- Doebeli, M., C. Hauert, and T. Killingback, 2004. The evolutionary origin of cooperators and defectors. Science 306:859–862.
- Doebeli, M. and I. Ispolatov, 2013. Symmetric competition as a general model for single-species adaptive dynamics. Journal of Mathematical Biology Pp. 169–184.
- —, 2014. Chaos and unpredictability in evolution. Evolution 68:1365–1373. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/evo.12354.
- Doebeli, M. and Y. Ispolatov, 2010. Complexity and diversity. Science 328:493–497.
- Geritz, S., , J. Metz, and C. Rueffler, 2016. Mutual invadability near evolutionarily singular strategies for multivariate traits, with special reference to the strongly convergence stable case. Journal of Mathematical Biology 72:1081–1099.
- Geritz, S. A. H., E. Kisdi, G. Meszéna, and J. A. J. Metz, 1998. Evolutionarily singular strategies and the adaptive growth and branching of the evolutionary tree. Evolutionary Ecology 12:35– 57.
- Gyllenberg, M. and K. Parvinen, 2001. Necessary and sufficient conditions for evolutionary suicide. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 63:981–993.
- Ispolatov, I., V. Madhok, and M. Doebeli, 2016. Individual-based models for adaptive diversification in high-dimensional phenotype spaces. Journal of Theoretical Biology 390:97–105.
- Ito, H. C. and U. Dieckmann, 2014. Evolutionary branching under slow directional evolution. Journal of Theoretical Biology 360:290–314. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2013.08.028.
- Leimar, O., 2009. Multidimensional convergence stability. Evolutionary Ecology Research 11:191–208.
- MacArthur, R. H. and R. Levins, 1967. Limiting similarity, convergence and divergence of coexisting species. American Naturalist 101:377–385.

- Metz, J. A. J., R. M. Nisbet, and S. A. H. Geritz, 1992. How should we define fitness for general ecological scenarios. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 7:198–202.
- Rego-Costa, A., F. Débarre, and L. Chevin, 2017. Chaos and the (un) predictability of evolution in a changing environment. Evolution 72:375–385.
- Roughgarden, J., 1979. Theory of population genetics and evolutionary ecology an introduction. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., USA.
- Slatkin, M., 1980. Ecological character displacement. Ecology 61:163–177.
- Svardal, H., C. Rueffler, and M. Doebeli, 2014. Organismal complexity and the potential for evolutionary diversification. Evolution 68:3248–3259. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/evo.12492.
- Taper, M. L. and T. J. Case, 1985. Quantitative genetic models for the coevolution of character displacement. Ecology 66:355–371.