

# Evolutionary game dynamics for generalized forms of effective payoff function

Feng Huang<sup>1,\*</sup>, Xiaojie Chen<sup>2</sup>, and Long Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Center for Systems and Control, College of Engineering,  
Peking University, Beijing 100871, P. R. China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Electronic Science  
and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, P. R. China*

(Dated: January 27, 2023)

In the most studies regarding evolutionary game dynamics, the effective payoff, a quantity that translates the payoff derived from game interactions into reproductive success, is usually assumed to be a specific function of the payoff. In the meanwhile, the effect of different effective payoff functions on evolutionary dynamics is always left in the basket. With introducing a generalized mapping that the effective payoff of individuals is a non-negative function of two variables on selection intensity and payoff, we study how different effective payoff functions affect evolutionary dynamics in a symmetrical mutation-selection process. For standard two-strategy two-player games, we find that under weak selection the condition for one strategy to dominate the other depends not only on the classical  $\sigma$ -rule, but also on an extra constant that is determined by the form of the effective payoff function. By changing the sign of the constant, we can alter the direction of strategy selection. Taking Moran process and pairwise comparison process as specific models in well-mixed populations, we find that different fitness or imitation mappings are equivalent under weak selection. Moreover, the sign of the extra constant determines the direction of one-third law and risk-dominance for sufficiently large populations. This work thus helps to elucidate how the effective payoff functions as another fundamental ingredient of evolution affect evolutionary dynamics.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In a Darwinian evolutionary process, it mainly incorporates three fundamental ingredients: mutation, selection, and random drift [1]. Mutations create genotypic or phenotypic variation, which leads to the differences in individual fitness that selection acts upon. Influenced by the finite size of the population, random drift accounts for stochastic effects during the process of evolution. By incorporating game theory with Darwinian evolution [2, 3], evolutionary game theory has become a powerful mathematical framework to model biological [4, 5] and social [6, 7] evolution in a population consisting of different types of interacting individuals under frequency-dependent selection.

Traditionally, a widely used system that focuses on the effects of frequency-dependent selection is the replicator equation [8, 9], where the population is infinitely large well-mixed and the stochastic effect is exclusively overlooked usually. However, if we want to understand the evolution of a dynamical system in a more realistic situation where the population is finite well-mixed and subject to fluctuations, this deterministic approach is augmented and disturbed by random drift [10, 11]. For such finite populations with fluctuations, it needs to resort to the tool of stochastic evolutionary game dynamics for investigating the evolution of different traits [12–14]. In addition to the classical Wright-Fisher process [15–17], frequency-dependent Moran process [18, 19] and imitation-based pairwise comparison process [20–22] are two most common microscopic models of strategy spread-

ing in finite populations. The former describes a stochastic birth-death process, in which an individual is selected with a probability proportional to its fitness to reproduce an identical offspring and then the offspring replaces another randomly chosen individual. While the latter describes a process of social learning where two individuals are sampled randomly and then depending on the payoff comparison a focal player imitates the strategy of the other. Except for the well-mixed population setting, there are also lots of interest in studying evolutionary game dynamics in structured populations [23, 24]. Typically, the spatial geometry of population structure is modeled by regular lattices [25–29] or more general complex networks [30–33], where individual interactions merely occur among nearest neighbors.

For a game system, in general, the ingredients of influencing the final evolutionary outcomes are nothing but the model, update rule, mutation rate, and population structure, etc. Model and update rule determine the way of strategy spreading. Mutation rates measure the intensity of randomness. While the underlying population structure describes the geometry of individual interactions. Depending on the game interactions, each individual obtains a payoff, and finally it needs to translate into reproductive success, termed effective payoff [34]. For example, the effective payoff is known as fitness in Moran process, and imitation probability in pairwise comparison process. Based on the usual assumption that the effective payoff is the form of  $1 + (\text{Selection intensity}) \cdot (\text{Payoff})$ , for standard two-strategy two-player games, Tarnita et al. demonstrate that if the selection intensity is weak the condition for one strategy to dominate the other is determined by a ‘ $\sigma$ -rule’ [34]. The parameter  $\sigma$ , termed structure coefficient, is a quantity that only depends on the population structure, update rule, and mutation rate,

---

\* apisflorea2015@gmail.com

but does not depend on the payoff values. Later, this work attracts wide interest [35–38]. For two-player games with multiple strategies, it involves two structure coefficients [35]. To calculate them, investigating games with three strategies is enough. While for the multi-player games with two strategies where the group size of playing a game is  $d$  individuals, the  $\sigma$ -rule will depend on  $d - 1$  structure coefficients [36]. In particular, for a more general setting of multi-player games with many strategies, this rule turns out to be quite complicated and the number of structure coefficients required for a symmetric game with  $d$ -player and  $n$ -strategy grows in  $d$  like  $d^{n-1}$  [37]. Clearly, because the form of the effective payoff is a specific function in these works, the  $\sigma$ -rule does not reflect the influence of the effective payoff function on evolutionary outcomes.

In evolutionary biology, however, how to measure the genotype-fitness map (i.e., the fitness landscape) is always a challenging issue, and now it has been accepted that the shape of the genotype-fitness map has fundamental effects on the course of evolution [39]. In addition, based on a Markov chain model, it has been demonstrated that the heterogeneity of individual background fitness can act as a suppressor of selection [40]. In a way, therefore, it means that the form of the effective payoff function (which translates the payoff derived from game interactions into the ability of reproductive success) has a significant effect on the evolution of game dynamics.

To this end, by introducing a generalized mapping that the effective payoff of each player is a non-negative function of two variables on selection intensity and payoff, we study the effect of different function forms of effective payoff on evolutionary dynamics and accordingly extend the results given by Tarnita et al. [34]. We find that if the first-order derivative of the effective payoff function can be written by a linear combination of payoff, then the condition for one strategy to dominate the other depends not only on the  $\sigma$ -rule, but also on an extra constant which is determined by the effective payoff function. This constant determines the direction of  $\sigma$ -rule (strategy selection). Additionally, taking Moran process and pairwise comparison process as specific models in well-mixed populations, we find that different fitness or imitation mappings are equivalent under weak selection and the extra constant determines the direction of one-third law and risk-dominance in the limit of large populations.

## II. MODEL AND RESULTS

In a structured population with  $N$  players, we consider stochastic evolutionary dynamics induced by a mutation-selection process. Each player can choose an arbitrary strategy from  $A$  or  $B$ . Then, depending on the payoff matrix

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{c} A \\ B \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} A \\ B \end{array} & \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \end{array} \quad (1)$$

players obtain an accumulative payoff by interacting with other individuals based on the underlying population structure. For example, when an  $A$  player interacts with another  $A$  player, it will obtain a payoff  $a$ , but  $b$  when interacting with a  $B$  player. Likewise, a  $B$  player can obtain a payoff  $c$  when interacting with an  $A$  player, and payoff  $d$  when interacting with another  $B$  player. Therefore, the total payoff of each player is a linear function of  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$  without including constant terms. For an  $A$  player, for instance, the total payoff is  $a \cdot (\text{number of } A\text{-neighbors}) + b \cdot (\text{number of } B\text{-neighbors})$ . To study the effect of effective payoff functions on the evolutionary dynamics, instead of a specific form, we assume that the effective payoff of a player is given by  $\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})$ . Parameter  $\beta$  measures the intensity of selection, and  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  corresponds to the case of weak selection [18, 41, 42].

The reproductive process of each player is dependent on the update rule and its effective payoff, and subject to mutations. With probability  $\mu$ , a mutation occurs and the offspring adopts a strategy ( $A$  or  $B$ ) at random. Otherwise, with probability  $1 - \mu$ , the offspring inherits its parent's strategy. For  $\mu = 1$ , there are only mutations, no selection, and strategy choice is completely random. If  $0 < \mu < 1$ , there exists a mutation-selection equilibrium.

For the game of two strategies, the frequency of  $A$  players in the population defines a finite state space,  $S$ , and the evolutionary dynamics can be captured by a Markov process on this state space. We denote the transition probability from state  $S_i$  to state  $S_j$  by  $P_{ij}$ . Since the transition probability depends on the update rule and on the effective payoff of players [34], it can be given by  $P_{ij}[\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})]$ . We assume that  $\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})$  is differentiable at  $\beta = 0$ . In the limit of weak selection, then we can give  $\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})$  in the form of first-order Taylor expansions,

$$\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff}) = \varphi_0 + \varphi^{(1)}(0) \cdot \beta + O(\beta^2), \quad (2)$$

where  $\varphi_0 := \varphi(0, \text{Payoff})$  represents the baseline effective payoff of each player, and  $\varphi^{(1)}(0) := [\partial\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})/\partial\beta]_{\beta=0}$  represents the first-order coefficient of selection intensity. If  $\varphi^{(1)}(0)$  can be written by the linear combination of payoff, that is  $\varphi^{(1)}(0) = [\partial\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})/\partial\beta]_{\beta=0} = k_0 \cdot \text{Payoff} + c_0$ , then the transition probability is given by  $P_{ij}[\varphi_0 + (k_0 \cdot \text{Payoff} + c_0)\beta + O(\beta^2)]$ . Clearly, the constants,  $k_0$  and  $c_0$ , are dependent on the choice of the function  $\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})$  and may rely on the entries of payoff matrix. In addition, actually a large body of functions meet the condition  $\varphi^{(1)}(0) = k_0 \cdot \text{Payoff} + c_0$ , such as  $\varphi(\beta \cdot \text{Payoff})$ . Therefore, this condition is not a harsh requirement. Note that the payoff of players is linear in  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$  without constant terms, it follows that the transition probability is the function  $P_{ij}[(k_0a + c_0)\beta, (k_0b + c_0)\beta, (k_0c + c_0)\beta, (k_0d + c_0)\beta]$ . Then, based on the notation  $(a', b', c', d') := (k_0a + c_0, k_0b + c_0, k_0c + c_0, k_0d + c_0)$  and following the proof given in Ref. [34], we know that the condition

that strategy  $A$  is favored over strategy  $B$  (i.e., strategy  $A$  is more abundant than  $B$  in the mutation-selection equilibrium) is  $\sigma a' + b' > c' + \sigma d'$ , where  $\sigma$  is a parameter that depends on the population structure, update rule, and mutation rate. Accordingly, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** Consider a population structure and an update rule that meet the three conditions shown in Ref. [34], i.e., (i) the transition probabilities are differentiable at  $\beta = 0$ ; (ii) the update rule is symmetric for the two strategies; and (iii) in the game given by the matrix entries,  $a = c = d = 0$  and  $b = 1$ , strategy  $A$  is not disfavored. Then, in the limit of weak selection, if the function of the effective payoff  $\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})$  meets the condition  $[\partial\varphi(\beta, \text{Payoff})/\partial\beta]_{\beta=0} = k_0 \cdot \text{Payoff} + c_0$ , then the condition that strategy  $A$  is favored over strategy  $B$  is given by

$$k_0(\sigma a + b - c - \sigma d) > 0, \quad (3)$$

where  $k_0$  is a constant that relies on the function of effective payoff and may be related to the entries of payoff matrix;  $\sigma$  is the structure coefficient defined by Ref. [34], which depends on the model and the dynamics (population structure, update rule, and mutation rate).

This theorem implies that the condition for one strategy to dominate the other is not only dependent on the classical  $\sigma$ -rule but also on an extra constant  $k_0$  that is determined by the effective payoff function. Actually, the constant  $k_0$  determines the direction of  $\sigma$ -rule (strategy selection). If the effective payoff function is given such that the constant  $k_0$  is positive, the theorem recovers the classical  $\sigma$ -rule (selection favors  $A$  to dominate  $B$ ) [34]. Otherwise, if the effective payoff function is given such that  $k_0$  is negative, the  $\sigma$ -rule will reverse the direction (selection favors  $B$  to dominate  $A$ ).

### III. MORAN PROCESS AND PAIRWISE COMPARISON PROCESS

To check the validity of our theorem and to study how the effective payoff function influences the evolutionary outcomes in a specific dynamic process, here we consider the frequency-dependent Moran process and pairwise comparison process. These two processes represent two typical evolutionary dynamics. The former describes how successful strategies spread in the population through genetic reproduction, whereas the latter describes such process through cultural imitation.

In Moran process, the effective payoff is known as individual fitness, which measures the ability to survive and produce offspring. Usually, the fitness is assumed to be a convex combination of a background fitness (which is set to one) and the payoff from the game [18, 19], or an exponential function of payoff [14, 43]. Under these

specific forms, the constant  $k_0$  related to the fitness function actually turns to 1 and it reduces to the previous results [14, 18]. Instead of the specific forms of fitness functions, here we adopt the generalized mapping that the fitness of a player is an any non-negative function of two variables on selection intensity and payoff,  $f(\beta, \text{Payoff})$ . With a probability proportional to the fitness, an individual is selected randomly for reproduction. And then one identical offspring replaces another randomly chosen individual. Since mutation occurs during the process of reproduction, it follows that the transition probabilities are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,i+1} &= \frac{if(\beta, \pi_A)(1 - \mu) + (N - i)f(\beta, \pi_B)\mu}{if(\beta, \pi_A) + (N - i)f(\beta, \pi_B)} \frac{N - i}{N}, \\ P_{i,i-1} &= \frac{(N - i)f(\beta, \pi_B)(1 - \mu) + if(\beta, \pi_A)\mu}{if(\beta, \pi_A) + (N - i)f(\beta, \pi_B)} \frac{i}{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi_A(i) := [a(i - 1) + b(N - i)]/(N - 1)$  and  $\pi_B(i) := [ci + d(N - i - 1)]/(N - 1)$  are the average payoffs of an  $A$  player and a  $B$  player, respectively.

While in pairwise comparison process, the effective payoff is known as the imitation probability. Two individuals are sampled randomly and then a focal player imitates the strategy of the role model with a probability depending on the payoff comparison [20, 22]. As usual, the imitation probability is modeled by the Fermi function with considering the effect of noise [23, 26, 27]. Thus, this process is also called Fermi process. Under the situation that the effective payoff mapping is non-specified, however, the imitation probability function for pairwise comparison process should be given by  $g(\beta, \Delta\pi)$ . Here,  $\Delta\pi$  denotes the difference of average payoffs between strategy  $A$  and  $B$ . In the presence of mutations, this imitation process occurs accurately with probability  $1 - \mu$ . Otherwise, with probability  $\mu$ , the focal player adopts a random strategy,  $A$  or  $B$ . Then, it leads to the transition probabilities,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,i+1} &= (1 - \mu) \frac{i}{N} \frac{N - i}{N} g(\beta, \Delta\pi(i)) + \frac{N - i}{N} \frac{\mu}{2}, \\ P_{i,i-1} &= (1 - \mu) \frac{i}{N} \frac{N - i}{N} g(\beta, -\Delta\pi(i)) + \frac{i}{N} \frac{\mu}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\Delta\pi(i) := \pi_A(i) - \pi_B(i) = ui + v$ . Here, the parameters  $u$  and  $v$  are defined by  $u := (a - b - c + d)/(N - 1)$  and  $v := (Nb - Nd - a + d)/(N - 1)$ , respectively.

Moreover, for both processes, the probability to stay in the current state is  $1 - P_{i,i+1} - P_{i,i-1}$ , and the probability to transform to other states is vanishing. In what follows, we first calculate the fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak selection when mutations are vanishing. Then, we obtain the criterion that strategy  $A$  is favored over strategy  $B$  in this case, and extend this criterion to small mutation rates finally.

## A. Fixation probabilities and fixation times

If there are no mutations in these two game systems, then one quantity of most interest is the fixation probability,  $\phi_i$ , which describes the probability that  $i$  individuals of type  $A$  reach fixation at all  $A$ . Another significant quantity is the average time for a single  $A$  player reaching fixation [14, 15, 44–46]. The former measures the preference of natural selection whereas the latter characterizes the evolutionary velocity of the system.

First, we follow the conditions given by **Theorem 1**, that is, the first-order derivative of fitness function for Moran process can be written by  $f_\beta(0, \pi) = k_0^{(m)} \cdot \pi + c_0^{(m)}$ , and the one of imitation probability function for pairwise comparison process can be written by  $g_\beta(0, \Delta\pi) = k_0^{(p)} \cdot \Delta\pi + c_0^{(p)}$ . Here,  $k_0^{(m)}$  and  $c_0^{(m)}$  ( $k_0^{(p)}$  and  $c_0^{(p)}$ ) are two constants that depend on the choice of fitness (imitation probability) function and may be related to the entries of payoff matrix. With the notations  $m_0 := k_0^{(m)}/f_0$  and  $p_0 := 2k_0^{(p)}/g_0 = k_0^{(p)}/g_0^2$ , where  $f_0 = f(0, \pi)$  is the baseline fitness of each player and  $g_0 = g(0, \Delta\pi) = 1/2$  is the probability of random imitation, we obtain the approximation of fixation probabilities under weak selection (details for Appendix A) as

$$\phi_i \approx \frac{i}{N} + \beta \cdot s \cdot \frac{i(N-i)[(N+i)u + 3v]}{6N}, \quad (6)$$

where  $s = m_0$  for frequency-dependent Moran process, and  $s = p_0$  for pairwise comparison process.

While for the average times of a single  $A$  player reaching fixation, there are two kinds of fixation times that attract much research attention [14, 45, 47]. The first one is the unconditional average time of fixation  $t_i$ , which is the expected value for the time until the population reaches one of the two absorbing states, all  $A$  and all  $B$ , when starting from the state  $i$ . Another is the conditional average time of fixation  $t_i^A$ , which specifies the expected time that the players of type  $A$  take to reach the absorbing state, all  $A$ , when starting from the state  $i$ . In particular, we are more interested in the average times,  $t_1$  and  $t_1^A$ , when initially starting from a single  $A$  individual in a  $B$  resident population. In the limit of weak selection, we find that the unconditional and conditional fixation times for Moran process (details for Appendix B) can be approximated to

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &\approx NH_{N-1} + m_0 v \frac{N}{2} (N+1 - 2H_N) \beta, \\ t_1^A &\approx N(N-1) - m_0 u \frac{N^2(N^2 - 3N + 2)}{36} \beta, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

whereas for pairwise comparison process, they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &\approx 2NH_{N-1} + p_0 v N(N-1 - H_{N-1}) \beta, \\ t_1^A &\approx 2N(N-1) - p_0 u N(N-1) \frac{N^2 + N - 6}{18} \beta, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $H_N = \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{1}{l}$  is the harmonic number.

Interestingly, for both Moran process and pairwise comparison process, if the first-order derivative of effective payoff function (i.e., fitness and imitation probability function) can be written by the linear combination of payoff, the difference of the influence of effective payoff functions on evolutionary outcomes just embodies in the coefficients before selection intensity,  $m_0$  and  $p_0$ . By proper rescaling, actually, these constant coefficients can be absorbed into the selection intensity, or make all payoff matrix entries ( $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$ ) change a scale in view of the exact formulations of  $u$  and  $v$ . In this sense, therefore, two arbitrary fitness functions for Moran process and imitation probability functions for pairwise comparison process are equivalent under weak selection. In particular, if we adopt the linear or exponential form of payoff as the fitness function, or the Fermi function as the imitation probability, both  $m_0$  and  $p_0$  are 1, which recovers the previous results [47] as specific cases. Moreover, taking the constant 1 as benchmark, if a fitness or imitation probability function is chosen to meet  $|m_0| > 1$  or  $|p_0| > 1$ , then this function acts as an amplifier of selection (facilitating the fixation of advantage individuals and decreasing the fixation time). Otherwise, if  $|m_0| < 1$  or  $|p_0| < 1$ , this function acts as a suppressor of selection




FIG. 1. The effect of fitness and imitation probability functions on evolutionary dynamics acts as a selection amplifier or suppressor. Using the payoff matrix entries,  $a = b = 1.2$  and  $c = d = 1.0$  (i.e., strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$ ), we show the fixation probabilities and conditional fixation times of a single  $A$  in Moran process (panel (a) and (b)) and pairwise comparison process (panel (c) and (d)), respectively. Lines are analytical results based on Eqs. (A9) and (B4), while symbols are simulations. If a fitness ((a) and (b)) or imitation probability ((c) and (d)) function is applied such that  $|m_0| > 1$  or  $|p_0| > 1$  (red lines), it promotes the fixation of advantage strategy and decreases the fixation time relative to the case  $|m_0| = 1$  or  $|p_0| = 1$  (blue lines). Otherwise, if  $|m_0| < 1$  or  $|p_0| < 1$  (purple lines), it suppresses the fixation of advantage strategy and increases the fixation time relative to the case  $|m_0| = 1$  or  $|p_0| = 1$  (blue lines).

(suppressing the fixation of advantage individuals and increasing the fixation time). This result holds not only for weak selection, but also for intermediate selection intensity (see Fig. 1).

## B. Equivalence

Based on the calculations of fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak selection, here we give the equivalence induced by generalized mappings in Moran process and pairwise comparison process. Specifically, for frequency-dependent Moran process with a generalized fitness function  $f(\beta, \pi)$ , if the first-order derivative of  $f(\beta, \pi)$  at  $\beta = 0$  can be written by  $f_\beta(0, \pi) = k_0^{(m)} \cdot \pi + c_0^{(m)}$ , we know that the approximations of fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak selection are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i &\approx \frac{i}{N} + m_0 \beta \frac{i(N-i)[(N+i)u + 3v]}{6N}, \\ t_1 &\approx NH_{N-1} + m_0 v \frac{N}{2} (N+1 - 2H_N) \beta, \\ t_1^A &\approx N(N-1) - m_0 u \frac{N^2(N^2 - 3N + 2)}{36} \beta,\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

where  $f_0 := f(0, \pi)$  and  $m_0 := k_0^{(m)}/f_0$  are both constants, and  $H_N = \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{1}{l}$  is the harmonic number. The influence of any two different fitness functions on evolutionary outcomes just embodies in the constant factor  $m_0$  before the selection intensity. Thus, in this sense, for two arbitrary fitness mappings,  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , meeting the conditions defined above, they are equivalent under weak selection. The equivalence means that the difference of fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak selection just embodies in the constant factor  $m_0$ , with which the payoff matrix or intensity of selection changes a scale.

Particularly, if the fitness function adopts one of the function families,  $F_1(\beta, \pi) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j \beta^j + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i (\beta \pi)^i$  ( $m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ) and  $F_2(\beta, \pi) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j \beta^j + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \beta^i \pi$  ( $m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ), where  $a_j$  and  $b_i$  are constant coefficients, then we have the same factor  $m_0 = b_1/a_0$ . Interestingly, if  $m_0 = b_1/a_0 = 1$ , these two function families are equivalent to the prevalent fitness mappings  $1 - \beta + \beta\pi$  and  $\exp(\beta\pi)$  under weak selection (see Fig. 2). Actually, the Taylor series of  $\exp(\beta\pi)$  at  $\beta = 0$  is just the function family  $F_1$  when specific coefficients  $a_0 = 1$ ,  $a_j = 0$  ( $j \neq 0$ ),  $b_1 = 1$ , and  $b_i = 1/(i b_{i-1})$  are applied.

Similarly, for pairwise comparison process with a generalized imitation probability function  $g(\beta, \Delta\pi)$ , if the first-order derivative of  $g(\beta, \Delta\pi)$  at  $\beta = 0$  can be written by  $g_\beta(0, \Delta\pi) = k_0^{(p)} \cdot \Delta\pi + c_0^{(p)}$ , then the approximations of fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak

selection are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i &\approx \frac{i}{N} + p_0 \beta \frac{i(N-i)[(N+i)u + 3v]}{6N}, \\ t_1 &\approx 2NH_{N-1} + p_0 v N(N-1 - H_{N-1}) \beta, \\ t_1^A &\approx 2N(N-1) - p_0 u N(N-1) \frac{N^2 + N - 6}{18} \beta,\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where  $g_0 := g(0, \Delta\pi) = 1/2$ ,  $p_0 := 2k_0^{(p)}/g_0 = k_0^{(p)}/g_0^2$ , and  $H_{N-1} = \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{l}$  is the harmonic number. The influence of any two different imitation probability functions on evolutionary outcomes also embodies in a constant factor before the selection intensity,  $p_0$ . Thus, for two arbitrary imitation probability functions,  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , meeting the conditions defined above, they are also equivalent under weak selection. The equivalence follows the same meaning as that in Moran process, that is, the difference of fixation probabilities and fixation times under weak selection just embodies in the constant factor  $p_0$ , with which the payoff matrix or selection intensity changes a scale.

Surprisingly, in comparison with the fitness function families  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , the function families with a completely analogous formulation  $G_1(\beta, \Delta\pi) = \sum_{j=0}^m \alpha_j \beta^j + \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i (\beta \Delta\pi)^i$  and  $G_2(\beta, \Delta\pi) = \sum_{j=0}^m \alpha_j \beta^j + \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \beta^i \Delta\pi$  ( $m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ), where  $\alpha_j$  and  $\eta_i$  are constant coefficients, are a class of imitation probability functions meeting the conditions given by pairwise comparison process. Particularly, if  $\eta_1 = 1/4$ , these two function families are equivalent to the popular Fermi function  $1/(1+e^{-\beta\Delta\pi})$  under weak selection (see Fig. 2). Actually, with choosing specific coefficients,  $G_1$  can also become the Taylor series of Fermi function at  $\beta = 0$ .

## C. One-third law and risk-dominance

In stochastic evolutionary game dynamics, the notions of invasion and fixation are two fundamental concepts to describe the spreading of strategies in finite populations [18, 19]. Using the neutral game as benchmark, strategy  $A$  is shortly said to fixate in a resident population (selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$ ) if the fixation probability for a single  $A$  is larger than that in the neutral game [18, 19]. Thus, for frequency-dependent Moran process with the fitness function  $f(\beta, \pi)$ , which fulfills the condition of first-order derivative given above, selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  under weak selection if  $m_0[(N+1)u + 3v] > 0$  (see Eq. (9)). Similarly, for pairwise comparison process with the generalized imitation probability function  $g(\beta, \Delta\pi)$ , selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  under weak selection if  $p_0[(N+1)u + 3v] > 0$  (see Eq. (10)). In view of the notations  $m_0 := k_0^{(m)}/f_0$  and  $p_0 := 2k_0^{(p)}/g_0 = k_0^{(p)}/g_0^2$ , it follows that the criterion that selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  under weak selection is  $k_0[(N+1)u + 3v] > 0$ , where  $k_0 = k_0^{(m)}$  for Moran




FIG. 2. Equivalence of fitness-based Moran process and imitation-based pairwise comparison process under weak selection. In the first row, we show the fixation probability  $\phi_1$  (panel (a)), unconditional fixation time  $t_1$  (panel (b)), and conditional fixation time  $t_1^A$  (panel (c)) of a single mutant  $A$  in fitness-based Moran process, respectively. The exact analytical results are depicted by solid lines with symbols, and accordingly we show the weak selection approximations by short dash dots, based on a class of equivalent fitness functions. The same manipulation is repeated for pairwise comparison process with a class of equivalent imitation probability functions, as shown in the second row. Analytical results are numerical calculations on the basis of exact Eqs. (A9), (B2), and (B4), but weak selection approximations are based on Eqs. (9) and (10). Parameters are  $N = 100$ ,  $a = 4$ ,  $b = 1$ ,  $c = 1$ , and  $d = 5$  (coordination games) in all panels. (The results are also valid for dominance and coexistence games.)

process and  $k_0 = k_0^{(p)}$  for pairwise comparison process. Specifically, we have

- When  $k_0 > 0$ , selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  ( $\phi_1 > 1/N$ ) if

$$a(N-2) + b(2N-1) > c(N+1) + d(2N-4).$$

Particularly, for sufficiently large population size  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , it corresponds to one-third law [18] in the case of coordination games ( $1/3 > (d-b)/(a-b-c+d)$ ) (see Fig. 3).

- When  $k_0 < 0$ , selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  ( $\phi_1 > 1/N$ ) if

$$a(N-2) + b(2N-1) < c(N+1) + d(2N-4).$$

Particularly, for sufficiently large population size  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , the classical one-third law is reversed in the case of coordination games ( $1/3 < (d-b)/(a-b-c+d)$ ) (see Fig. 3).

- When  $k_0 = 0$ , the condition that selection favors  $A$  replacing  $B$  under weak selection will depend on the high order coefficients of  $\beta$  in  $\phi_1$ . Actually, the calculations of high order coefficients under weak selection are more tedious than the linear approximation, which can refer to Refs. [41, 48].

Except for the underlying principle that determines the conditions of favoring strategy  $A$  to replace  $B$ , it is also of interest to ask whether strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$ , which termed ‘strategy selection’ [34]. First, let  $\rho_A$  ( $\rho_B$ ) denotes the fixation probability that a single individual using strategy  $A$  ( $B$ ) invades and takes over a resident population of  $B$  ( $A$ ) players. Accordingly, we have  $\rho_A = \phi_1$ . And note that the probability  $\rho_B$  is equal to that  $N-1$  individuals of  $A$  strategy fail to take over a population in which there is just a single  $B$  individual, then we have  $\rho_B = 1 - \phi_{N-1}$ . Based on Eq. (A9), the ratio of these two fixation probabilities is thus given by

$$\rho_B/\rho_A = \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \gamma_j, \quad (11)$$

where  $\gamma_j = P_{j,j-1}/P_{j,j+1}$  is the ratio of transition probabilities in the case of vanishing mutations,  $\mu = 0$ . Then depending on Eq. (A8), the ratio of the two fixation probabilities under weak selection can be approximated to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_B/\rho_A &\approx 1 - s\beta \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (uj + v) \\ &= 1 - \frac{s\beta}{2} [a(N-2) + bN - cN - d(N-2)], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $s = m_0$  for Moran process, and  $s = p_0$  for pairwise comparison process. In view of the definitions of  $m_0$  and  $p_0$ , therefore, the condition that strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$  is given by  $k_0(\sigma a + b - c - \sigma d) > 0$ , where  $k_0 = k_0^{(m)}$  for Moran process but  $k_0 = k_0^{(p)}$  for pairwise comparison process, and  $\sigma = (N - 2)/N$  is the structure coefficient of well-mixed population [34]. Under weak selection, specifically we have

- When  $k_0 > 0$ , the condition that strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$  is

$$\sigma a + b > c + \sigma d.$$

Particularly, for sufficiently large population size  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , it corresponds to that  $A$  is risk-dominant in the case of coordination games ( $1/2 > (d - b)/(a - b - c + d)$ ) (see Fig. 3).

- When  $k_0 < 0$ , the condition that strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$  is

$$\sigma a + b < c + \sigma d.$$

Particularly, for sufficiently large population size  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , it corresponds to that  $B$  is risk-dominant in the case of coordination games ( $1/2 < (d - b)/(a - b - c + d)$ ) (see Fig. 3).

- When  $k_0 = 0$ , the condition that strategy  $A$  is selected over strategy  $B$  under weak selection will depend on the high order coefficients of  $\beta$  in  $\rho_B/\rho_A$ . Similarly, the calculations of high order approximation under weak selection will be more tedious, which can refer to Refs. [41, 48].

In particular, if we additionally consider the case where small non-uniform mutations occur between the two strategies, that strategy  $A$  is more abundant than  $B$  in the long run is determined by [49, 50]

$$\frac{\mu_{AB}\rho_B}{\mu_{BA}\rho_A} < 1, \quad (13)$$

where  $\mu_{AB}$  and  $\mu_{BA}$  denote the mutation rates from  $A$  to  $B$  and from  $B$  to  $A$ , respectively. For  $\mu_{AB} = \mu_{BA}$ , we find that the conclusions obtained above are still valid. This also validates the availability of our theorem.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

In the most studies regarding evolutionary game dynamics, the effective payoff that characterizes the ability of individual reproductive success is assumed as a specific function of selection intensity and payoff. For example, the fitness in Moran process is usually assumed to be a convex combination of a background fitness and the fitness derived from game interactions [18, 19], or an exponential function of payoff [36, 43, 51], and the imitation probability in pairwise comparison process is modeled by

a Fermi function [23, 26, 27]. However, one direct result of this setting is that the final evolutionary outcomes do not reflect the effect of the form of the effective payoff function on evolutionary dynamics [14, 43]. Therefore, it is still unclear how the effective payoff function influences the evolutionary dynamics in a game system. But in evolutionary biology, no matter whether the theoretical or empirical research demonstrates that the fitness landscape has a fundamental effect on the course of evolution [39].

For standard two-strategy two-player games, based on a specific function of effective payoff, it has been demonstrated that under weak selection the condition that one strategy is more abundant than the other in a mutation-selection process is determined by a  $\sigma$ -rule. This  $\sigma$ -rule almost captures all aspects of evolutionary dynamics, but ignores the effect of the effective payoff function. Particularly, if the effective payoff function is an any non-negative function of the product of payoff and selection intensity [36, 41], the rule still holds. But it does not change the basic fact that the effect of the effective payoff function on evolutionary dynamics is exclusively overlooked. With introducing a generalized mapping that the effective payoff of individuals is a non-negative function of two variables on selection intensity and payoff, we find that the condition that one strategy is favored over the other relies not only on the  $\sigma$ -rule but also on an extra constant under mild conditions. This extra constant characterizes and depends on the effective payoff func-




FIG. 3. The direction of one-third law and risk dominance is determined by the choice of fitness mapping  $f(\beta, \pi)$  or imitation probability mapping  $g(\beta, \Delta\pi)$ . When  $k_0^{(m)} > 0$  for Moran process or  $k_0^{(p)} > 0$  for pairwise comparison process, it corresponds to the classical one-third law and risk-dominance in coordination games (a). While if  $k_0^{(m)} < 0$  for Moran process or  $k_0^{(p)} < 0$  for pairwise comparison process, then the direction of one-third law and risk-dominance will be reversed (b). Otherwise, the conditions for  $\rho_A > 1/N$  and  $\rho_A > \rho_B$  under weak selection will depend on the high order coefficients of fixation probabilities, vice versa.



tion. Moreover, this extra constant determines the direction of the  $\sigma$ -rule, with which the effect of the effective payoff function on evolutionary dynamics is shown.

Under a specific model of strategy spreading, such as frequency-dependent Moran process, if the fitness of the player is assumed to be a linear or exponential function of payoff, it is found that these two fitness mappings can lead to identical evolutionary dynamics under weak selection [14, 43], even in the presence of mutations [52, 53]. Similarly, there also exist some equivalent or analogous properties between Moran process and pairwise comparison process on the basis of specific fitness and imitation probability mappings [41, 47, 54]. By calculating the fixation probabilities and fixation times under the framework of generalized mappings, we generalize this understanding of equivalence in Moran and pairwise comparison process. We find that any two fitness functions in Moran process or two imitation probability functions in pairwise comparison process are equivalent under weak selection when some mild conditions are fulfilled. Particularly, for sufficiently large population size, an extra constant determined by the fitness or imitation probability function can determine the direction of one-third law and risk-dominance.

Undeniably, our main focus is just cast into the weak selection and the standard two-strategy two-player games, although intermediate and strong selection [42, 55, 56] also attracts much attention recently. In the limit of strong selection, actually, the dynamic outcomes of stochastic systems are nearly determinant and do not rely on the specific forms of fitness and imitation probability functions [55, 56]. In addition, except for the standard two-strategy two-player games, there are lots of research interest in the games of multiple players or strategies [35, 36, 38, 57]. Thus, extending our work in the framework of multi-player or multi-strategy games is worth the effort in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Bin Wu for helpful discussions and comments. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 61751301, No. 61533001, and No. 61503062).

### Appendix A: Fixation probabilities under weak selection

In the absence of mutations, that is  $\mu = 0$ , the transition probabilities for Moran process reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} T_i^+ &:= P_{i,i+1} = \frac{if(\beta, \pi_A)}{if(\beta, \pi_A) + (N-i)f(\beta, \pi_B)} \frac{N-i}{N}, \\ T_i^- &:= P_{i,i-1} = \frac{(N-i)f(\beta, \pi_B)}{if(\beta, \pi_A) + (N-i)f(\beta, \pi_B)} \frac{i}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

While for pairwise comparison process, they reduce to

$$T_i^\pm = \frac{i}{N} \frac{N-i}{N} g(\beta, \pm \Delta\pi(i)). \quad (\text{A2})$$

Based on Eqs. (A1) and (A2), first we obtain the ratio of transition probabilities for frequency-dependent Moran process (Moran) and imitation-based pairwise comparison process (PWC) as

$$\gamma_j = \frac{T_j^-}{T_j^+} = \begin{cases} \frac{f(\beta, \pi_B)}{f(\beta, \pi_A)} & \text{Moran,} \\ \frac{g(\beta, -\Delta\pi)}{g(\beta, \Delta\pi)} & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A3})$$

In the neutral case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j |_{\beta=0} &= \begin{cases} \frac{f_0}{f_0} & \text{Moran,} \\ \frac{g_0}{g_0} & \text{PWC,} \end{cases} \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where  $f_0 := f(0, \pi)$  is the baseline fitness of each player, which is independent on the payoff, and  $g_0 := g(0, \Delta\pi) = 1/2$  is the probability of random imitation, which is independent on the payoff difference.

Then, calculating the partial derivative at  $\beta = 0$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \gamma_j \right]_{\beta=0} &= \begin{cases} \frac{f_\beta(0, \pi_B) f(0, \pi_A) - f(0, \pi_B) f_\beta(0, \pi_A)}{f^2(0, \pi_A)} \\ \frac{g_\beta(0, -\Delta\pi) g(0, \Delta\pi) - g(0, -\Delta\pi) g_\beta(0, \Delta\pi)}{g^2(0, \Delta\pi)} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{f_\beta(0, \pi_B) - f_\beta(0, \pi_A)}{(\pi_B - \pi_A) f_0} (-\Delta\pi) & \text{Moran,} \\ \frac{g_\beta(0, -\Delta\pi) - g_\beta(0, \Delta\pi)}{-2g_0 \Delta\pi} (-2\Delta\pi) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Based on the conditions given by **Theorem 1**, the first-order derivative of fitness (imitation probability) function can be written by the linear combination of payoff (payoff difference), then we have  $f_\beta(0, \pi) = k_0^{(m)} \cdot \pi + c_0^{(m)}$  and  $g_\beta(0, \Delta\pi) = k_0^{(p)} \cdot \Delta\pi + c_0^{(p)}$ . Here, the parameters  $k_0^{(m)}$  and  $c_0^{(m)}$  ( $k_0^{(p)}$  and  $c_0^{(p)}$ ) are two constants that depend on the choice of fitness (imitation probability) function and may be related to the entries of the payoff matrix. In this case,  $[\partial \gamma_j / \partial \beta]_{\beta=0}$  can be given by

$$\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \gamma_j \right]_{\beta=0} = \begin{cases} \frac{k_0^{(m)}}{f_0} (-\Delta\pi) & \text{Moran,} \\ \frac{k_0^{(p)}}{g_0} (-2\Delta\pi) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Under weak selection, that is  $N\beta \ll 1$ , then the ratio  $\gamma_j$  can be approximated to

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j &\approx \gamma_j |_{\beta=0} + \beta \left[ \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial \beta} \right]_{\beta=0} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 - \beta m_0 \Delta\pi(j) & \text{Moran,} \\ 1 - \beta p_0 \Delta\pi(j) & \text{PWC,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$



where  $m_0 := k_0^{(m)}/f_0$  and  $p_0 := 2k_0^{(p)}/g_0 = k_0^{(p)}/g_0^2$ . Leaving out the high order term on  $\beta$ , accordingly the product of the ratio  $\gamma_j$  can be simplified to

$$\prod_{j=1}^k \gamma_j \approx \begin{cases} 1 - \beta m_0 \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta\pi(j) & \text{Moran,} \\ 1 - \beta p_0 \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta\pi(j) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Comparing with the specific cases where fitness is a linear or exponential function of payoff and imitation probability is modeled by the Fermi function [14], the influence of the generalized function form on the product of the ratio  $\gamma_j$  just rescales the selection intensity or payoff matrix by a constant factor,  $m_0$  or  $p_0$ . Substituting Eq. (A8) into the formula of fixation probabilities [12, 15],

$$\phi_i = \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \prod_{j=1}^k \gamma_j}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^k \gamma_j}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

under weak selection we obtain the approximation of fixation probabilities when initially starting from  $i$  individuals of strategy  $A$ , given by

$$\phi_i \approx \frac{i}{N} + \beta \cdot s \cdot \frac{i(N-i)[(N+i)u + 3v]}{6N}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where  $s = m_0$  for frequency-dependent Moran process, and  $s = p_0$  for pairwise comparison process.

## Appendix B: Fixation times under weak selection

Next, we derive the approximations of the unconditional and conditional fixation times,  $t_1$  and  $t_1^A$ , in the limit of weak selection,  $N\beta \ll 1$ . The general formulation of weak selection approximation is given by [47]

$$t \approx t|_{\beta=0} + \beta \left[ \frac{\partial t}{\partial \beta} \right]_{\beta=0}, \quad t = t_1 \text{ or } t_1^A. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Therefore, our main goal is to find the constant term and the coefficient of the first order term in Eq. (B1). Note that for the vanishing selection intensity  $\beta = 0$ , it corresponds to the case of neutral selection. That is, the mean times are typically not affected by the details of the evolutionary process. In this case, the neutral transition probabilities are  $T_i^\pm|_{\beta=0} = i(N-i)/N^2$  for Moran process, and  $T_i^\pm|_{\beta=0} = i(N-i)/(2N^2)$  for pairwise comparison process. Since  $T_i^+ = T_i^-$  for both processes, we have  $\gamma_i = 1$ . Moreover, with the notion  $\phi_i|_{\beta=0} = i/N$  based on Eq. (A10), and referring to the formula of unconditional fixation times [14, 15]

$$t_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{\phi_l}{T_l^+} \prod_{j=l+1}^k \gamma_j, \quad (\text{B2})$$

the neutral unconditional time of fixation is given by

$$t_1|_{\beta=0} = \begin{cases} NH_{N-1} & \text{Moran,} \\ 2NH_{N-1} & \text{PWC,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B3})$$

where  $H_{N-1} = \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{l}$  is the harmonic number. Similarly, based on the formula of conditional fixation times [14, 45]

$$t_1^A = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{\phi_l}{T_l^+} \prod_{j=l+1}^k \gamma_j, \quad (\text{B4})$$

the neutral conditional time of fixation is given by

$$t_1^A|_{\beta=0} = \begin{cases} N(N-1) & \text{Moran,} \\ 2N(N-1) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B5})$$

To obtain the complete formulation of fixation time under weak selection, we next need to compute the linear term  $[\frac{\partial t}{\partial \beta}]_{\beta=0}$ , which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{\partial t}{\partial \beta} \right]_{\beta=0} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \left[ \frac{1}{T_l^+} \frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial \beta} + \phi_l \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left( \frac{1}{T_l^+} \right) \right]_{\beta=0} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \left[ \frac{\phi_l}{T_l^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left( \prod_{j=l+1}^k \gamma_j \right) \right]_{\beta=0}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

where  $\left[ \prod_{j=l+1}^k \gamma_j \right]_{\beta=0} = 1$  is applied. Compared with the unconditional fixation time Eq. (B2), the only difference of conditional fixation time Eq. (B4) is the fixation probability  $\phi_l$  instead of  $\phi_1$ . Thus, Eq. (B6) is valid for both conditional and unconditional fixation times. But  $\phi_l$  changes to  $\phi_1$  for the latter.

On the other hand, in light of the fixation probabilities under weak selection Eq. (A10), we have

$$\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial \beta} |_{\beta=0} = s \frac{l(N-l)[(N+l)u + 3v]}{6N}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where  $s = m_0$  for frequency-dependent Moran process, and  $s = p_0$  for pairwise comparison process.

Comparing Eqs. (A1) and (A2), the inverse of the transition probability  $T_l^+$  under weak selection is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left( \frac{1}{T_l^+} \right) |_{\beta=0} = \begin{cases} -m_0 \frac{N}{l} \Delta\pi(l) & \text{Moran,} \\ -p_0 \frac{N^2}{l(N-1)} \Delta\pi(l) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B8})$$

Moreover, according to the product of ratio of transition probabilities under weak selection Eq. (A8), we have

$$\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \prod_{j=l+1}^k \gamma_j \right]_{\beta=0} = \begin{cases} -m_0 \sum_{j=l+1}^k \Delta\pi(j) & \text{Moran,} \\ -p_0 \sum_{j=l+1}^k \Delta\pi(j) & \text{PWC.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B9})$$

Substituting Eqs. (B7)–(B9) into Eq. (B6), we know that for Moran process the linear term of unconditional and conditional fixation times under weak selection is given

by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}t\right]_{\beta=0} &= m_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{q(N-q)[(N+q)u+3v]}{6N} \frac{N^2}{l(N-l)} \\
&- m_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{q}{N} N \frac{ul+v}{l} \\
&- m_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{q}{N} \frac{N^2}{l(N-l)} \sum_{m=l+1}^k (um+v),
\end{aligned} \tag{B10}$$

where  $q = 1$  for unconditional fixation times, and  $q = l$  for conditional fixation times. Based on the calculations given by Ref. [47], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}t_1\right]_{\beta=0} &= m_0 v \frac{N}{2} (N+1-2H_N), \\
\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}t_1^A\right]_{\beta=0} &= -m_0 u \frac{N^2(N^2-3N+2)}{36},
\end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

where  $H_N = \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{1}{l}$  is the harmonic number. Combining Eq. (B11) with Eqs. (B3) and (B5), for Moran process, finally it leads to the complete formulation of unconditional and conditional fixation times under weak selection

$$\begin{aligned}
t_1 &\approx NH_{N-1} + m_0 v \frac{N}{2} (N+1-2H_N)\beta, \\
t_1^A &\approx N(N-1) - m_0 u \frac{N^2(N^2-3N+2)}{36}\beta.
\end{aligned} \tag{B12}$$

Similarly, for pairwise comparison process, the linear term of fixation times is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}t\right]_{\beta=0} &= p_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{2N^2}{l(N-l)} \frac{q(N-q)[(N+q)u+3v]}{6N} \\
&- p_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{q}{N} \frac{N^2}{l(N-l)} \Delta\pi(l) \\
&- p_0 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{q}{N} \frac{2N^2}{l(N-l)} \sum_{m=l+1}^k (um+v),
\end{aligned} \tag{B13}$$

where  $q = 1$  for unconditional fixation times, and  $q = l$  for conditional fixation times. Based on the calculations given by Ref. [47], then under weak selection the unconditional and conditional fixation times for pairwise comparison process are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
t_1 &\approx 2NH_{N-1} + p_0 v N(N-1-H_{N-1})\beta, \\
t_1^A &\approx 2N(N-1) - p_0 u N(N-1) \frac{N^2+N-6}{18}\beta.
\end{aligned} \tag{B14}$$

- 
- [1] A. Traulsen, J. C. Claussen, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 011901 (2006).
- [2] J. Maynard Smith and G. R. Price, *Nature* **246**, 15 (1973).
- [3] J. Maynard Smith, *Evolution and the Theory of Games* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
- [4] P. E. Turner and L. Chao, *Nature* **398**, 441 (1999).
- [5] B. Kerr, M. A. Riley, M. W. Feldman, and B. J. Bohannan, *Nature* **418**, 171 (2002).
- [6] W. D. Hamilton, *J. Theor. Biol.* **7**, 1 (1964).
- [7] M. A. Nowak and K. Sigmund, *Nature* **437**, 1291 (2005).
- [8] P. D. Taylor and L. B. Jonker, *Math. Biosci.* **40**, 145 (1978).
- [9] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [10] N. G. Van Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry*, 2nd ed. (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1997).
- [11] C. W. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods*, 2nd ed. (Springer, New York, 2002).
- [12] M. A. Nowak, *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 2006).
- [13] A. Traulsen, J. M. Pacheco, and L. A. Imhof, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 021905 (2006).
- [14] A. Traulsen and C. Hauert, in *Reviews of Nonlinear Dynamics and Complexity*, edited by H.-G. Schuster (Wiley-VCH, New York, 2009).
- [15] W. J. Ewens, *Mathematical Population Genetics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Springer, 2012).
- [16] L. A. Imhof and M. A. Nowak, *J. Math. Biol.* **52**, 667 (2006).
- [17] T. Antal, H. Ohtsuki, J. Wakeley, P. D. Taylor, and M. A. Nowak, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 8597 (2009).
- [18] M. A. Nowak, A. Sasaki, C. Taylor, and D. Fudenberg, *Nature* **428**, 646 (2004).
- [19] C. Taylor, D. Fudenberg, A. Sasaki, and M. A. Nowak, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **66**, 1621 (2004).
- [20] A. Traulsen, J. C. Claussen, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 238701 (2005).
- [21] A. Traulsen, M. A. Nowak, and J. M. Pacheco, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 011909 (2006).
- [22] A. Traulsen, J. M. Pacheco, and M. A. Nowak, *J. Theor. Biol.* **246**, 522 (2007).
- [23] G. Szabó and G. Fath, *Phys. Rep.* **446**, 97 (2007).
- [24] M. Perc, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, A. Szolnoki, L. M. Floría, and Y. Moreno, *J. R. Soc. Interface* **10**, 20120997 (2013).
- [25] M. A. Nowak and R. M. May, *Nature* **359**, 826 (1992).
- [26] G. Szabó and C. Tóke, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 69 (1998).
- [27] C. Hauert and G. Szabó, *Am. J. Phys.* **73**, 405 (2005).
- [28] M. Perc and A. Szolnoki, *BioSystems* **99**, 109 (2010).
- [29] X. Chen, F. Fu, and L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 051120 (2008).
- [30] H. Ohtsuki, C. Hauert, E. Lieberman, and M. A. Nowak, *Nature* **441**, 502 (2006).
- [31] F. C. Santos, M. D. Santos, and J. M. Pacheco, *Nature* **454**, 213 (2008).
- [32] F. Fu, L. Wang, M. A. Nowak, and C. Hauert, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 046707 (2009).
- [33] X. Chen and L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 017103 (2008).
- [34] C. E. Tarnita, H. Ohtsuki, T. Antal, F. Fu, and M. A. Nowak, *J. Theor. Biol.* **259**, 570 (2009).
- [35] C. E. Tarnita, N. Wage, and M. A. Nowak, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 2334 (2011).
- [36] B. Wu, A. Traulsen, and C. S. Gokhale, *Games* **4**, 182 (2013).
- [37] A. McAvoy and C. Hauert, *J. Math. Biol.* **72**, 203 (2016).
- [38] J. Peña, B. Wu, J. Arranz, and A. Traulsen, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **12**, e1005059 (2016).
- [39] J. A. G. De Visser and J. Krug, *Nature Rev. Genet.* **15**, 480 (2014).
- [40] O. P. Hauser, A. Traulsen, and M. A. Nowak, *J. Theor. Biol.* **343**, 178 (2014).
- [41] B. Wu, P. M. Altrock, L. Wang, and A. Traulsen, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 046106 (2010).
- [42] B. Wu, J. García, C. Hauert, and A. Traulsen, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **9**, e1003381 (2013).
- [43] A. Traulsen, N. Shores, and M. A. Nowak, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **70**, 1410 (2008).
- [44] X. Sui, B. Wu, and L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 062124 (2015).
- [45] T. Antal and I. Scheuring, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **68**, 1923 (2006).
- [46] C. Taylor, Y. Iwasa, and M. A. Nowak, *J. Theor. Biol.* **243**, 245 (2006).
- [47] P. M. Altrock and A. Traulsen, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 013012 (2009).
- [48] W. Huang and A. Traulsen, *J. Theor. Biol.* **263**, 262 (2010).
- [49] J. García and A. Traulsen, *PLoS ONE* **7**, e35287 (2012).
- [50] B. Wu, C. S. Gokhale, L. Wang, and A. Traulsen, *J. Math. Biol.* **64**, 803 (2012).
- [51] F. Fu, C. E. Tarnita, N. A. Christakis, L. Wang, D. G. Rand, and M. A. Nowak, *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 460 (2012).
- [52] T. Antal, M. A. Nowak, and A. Traulsen, *J. Theor. Biol.* **257**, 340 (2009).
- [53] D. Fudenberg, M. A. Nowak, C. Taylor, and L. A. Imhof, *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **70**, 352 (2006).
- [54] B. Wu, B. Bauer, T. Galla, and A. Traulsen, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 023043 (2015).
- [55] P. M. Altrock and A. Traulsen, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 011909 (2009).
- [56] P. M. Altrock, A. Traulsen, and M. A. Nowak, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 022407 (2017).
- [57] S. Kurokawa and Y. Ihara, *Proc. R. Soc. B* **276**, 1379 (2009).