

# Sharp thresholds limit the benefit of defector avoidance in cooperation on networks

Ashkaan K. Fahimipour<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Fanqi Zeng<sup>3</sup>, Martin Homer<sup>3</sup>, Simon A. Levin<sup>4</sup>, and Thilo Gross<sup>2,5,6,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of California Santa Cruz, Institute of Marine Sciences, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup> University of California Davis, Department of Computer Science, Davis, CA, USA

<sup>3</sup> University of Bristol, Department of Engineering Mathematics, Bristol, UK

<sup>4</sup> Princeton University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton, NJ, USA

<sup>5</sup> Helmholtz Institute for Functional Marine Biodiversity, Oldenburg, DE

<sup>6</sup> Alfred-Wegener-Institute for Marine and Polar Research, Bremerhaven, DE

<sup>7</sup> University of Oldenburg, Institute for Chemistry and Biology of the Marine Environment, Oldenburg, DE

\*Correspondence to: [afahimip@ucsc.edu](mailto:afahimip@ucsc.edu)

---

Consider a cooperation game on a spatial network of habitat patches, where players can relocate between habitats if they judge the local conditions to be unfavorable. In time, the relocation events may lead to a homogeneous state where all patches harbor the same densities of cooperators and defectors or they may lead to self-organized patterns, where some patches become safe havens that maintain a high cooperator density. Here we analyze the transition between these states mathematically. We show that safe havens form once a certain threshold in connectivity is crossed. This threshold can be analytically linked to the structure of the patch network and specifically to certain network motifs. Surprisingly, a forgiving defector-avoidance strategy may be most favorable for cooperators. Our results demonstrate that the analysis of cooperation games in ecologically-inspired metacommunity models is mathematically tractable and has the potential to link diverse topics such as macroecological patterns, behavioral evolution, and network topology.

---

## Introduction

Cooperation is widespread across biological systems, ranging from cells cooperating to form organisms, to cooperation among individuals in populations and among micro- and macrobiotic taxa in ecosystems. The ways in which cooperation is maintained despite often high costs to the individual represents a fundamental question in biology that has received much recent attention [1–6]. In general, cooperation is most likely to evolve and persist if there are mechanism that directly or indirectly benefit cooperators' reproductive success. Examples include kin selection, punishment of defectors that forgo the cooperative investment, or a direct self-benefit from the cooperative behavior such as in cases of investment into a common good [3].

Among the most general mechanisms that can favor cooperation is the notion of spatial or network *reciprocity* [1, 7–9]. In classical examples of reciprocity, cooperation creates favorable conditions for other proximal cooperators [3]. A result is the emergence of cooperative havens where the rewards generated by mutual cooperation have enriched some physical or topological neighborhoods. Formation of safe havens for cooperation has traditionally been studied on networks where each node represents an individual [1]. In the case of weak selection, the resulting systems can be analyzed mathematically. Although this framework has become a powerful tool for understanding the evolution of cooperation, it represents a strong abstraction from real world ecology where

interactions occur often randomly within a local habitat patch that is itself embedded in a larger spatial context [10, 11]. Previous ecological work shows that considering these different scales and levels of organization leads to new complementary insights [12–14].

Here we study a model of cooperation inspired by ecological metacommunities [10, 11, 14, 15], where the network nodes instead represent habitat patches that are linked by avenues of dispersal. Each habitat harbors subpopulations of cooperators and defectors, which grow or shrink in time due to interactions within patches and movement among patches. Our central question is how dispersal behavior among patches affects the macroecological distribution of cooperation, and particularly the formation of safe havens for cooperation.

We consider a situation where cooperators leave a patch if they have been cheated in multiple consecutive interactions. Although easy to motivate psychologically, the choice to let the cooperators disperse more selectively is unusual, as it can convey an advantage to them. However, the objective in this paper is to explore exactly when this advantage has an impact on the outcomes of the game. As we show below, defector avoidance is not always beneficial for cooperators, often leaving outcomes unchanged. However, when certain thresholds are crossed, self-organized patterns form where some nodes have significantly higher or lower cooperator densities. Importantly, we demonstrate that these thresholds can be represented mathematically by master stability functions [15–17], which capture the emergence of spatial reciprocity in all networks, and link the emergence of reciprocity with certain network motifs.

## Results

### Introductory example

We start by illustrating the existence of sharp thresholds by considering a specific model. Most of the assumptions made here will be relaxed in the next section where we present the general theory.

For simplicity, consider a network of two linked nodes, where each node is a habitat patch in which organisms live, interact, and reproduce. The link between them represents an avenue of dispersal that individuals occasionally use to disperse to the other patch (Fig. 1A). Some of the individuals are cooperators (with density in patch  $i \in [1, 2]$  denoted by  $C_i$ ) who make an investment that creates a shared benefit, whereas other individuals are defectors ( $D_i$ ) who forego this investment.

Individuals in both patches are subject to population dynamics of the form

$$\dot{C}_i = G_{C,i} - M_{C,i} + \delta (E_{C,j} - E_{C,i}) \quad (1a)$$

$$\dot{D}_i = G_{D,i} - M_{D,i} + \delta (E_{D,j} - E_{D,i}), \quad (1b)$$

where  $G$ ,  $M$  and  $E$  are functions of cooperator and defector densities that are described below, and represent the effects of reproduction, mortality and dispersal; and  $\delta$  is the global link strength of the spatial network. Individuals within a patch undergo random pairwise encounters, which are modeled as a two-player snowdrift game with a payoff matrix

$$\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} R & S \\ T & P \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

which defines rewards for mutual cooperation  $R$ , the sucker's payoff  $S$ , the temptation to defect  $T$ , and the punishment for mutual defection  $P$  (Fig. 1A).

We assume that the reproduction of individuals is directly proportional to the payoff that they achieve in the game. Using mass-action laws for the encounters, this yields the reproduction rates

$$G_{C,i} = G_{C,i}(C_i, D_i) = C_i \frac{RC_i + SD_i}{C_i + D_i} \quad (3a)$$

$$G_{D,i} = G_{D,i}(C_i, D_i) = D_i \frac{TC_i + PD_i}{C_i + D_i}, \quad (3b)$$




Figure 1: Emergence of a heterogeneous stationary state on a 2-patch network. **A.** Schematic of the spatial game, showing local payoff ( $\Pi$ ) relationships among cooperators and defectors occupying the same patch (gray circles) and the dispersal route between them. **B.** Difference in equilibrium densities of both types in patches 1 and 2 as link strength is varied. Arrows refer to the example time series shown in panels C and D. **C.** The homogeneous steady state, with identical equilibrium densities of  $C$  and  $D$  across locations. The inset network shows whether cooperators or defectors dominate each patch (darker blues or reds, respectively). **D.** The same game, but with faster diffusion on the network, showing emergence of a heterogeneous steady state with high cooperator densities in patch 1. Parameters are:  $R = 3, S = 2, T = 5, P = 0.2, \mu = 1, \alpha = 3$ .

where, following [13], intrinsic growth and encounter rates are accommodated as part of  $R, S, T$ , and  $P$ . We assume density-dependent mortality, resulting in

$$M_{C,i} = M_{C,i}(C_i, D_i) = \mu C_i(C_i + D_i) \quad (4a)$$

$$M_{D,i} = M_{D,i}(C_i, D_i) = \mu D_i(C_i + D_i), \quad (4b)$$

where  $\mu$  is a rate constant. Finally, the effects of dispersal are

$$E_{C,i} = E_{C,i}(C_i, D_i) = C_i Z_{C,i} \quad (5a)$$

$$E_{D,i} = E_{D,i}(C_i, D_i) = D_i Z_{D,i}, \quad (5b)$$

where  $Z$  is the *per capita* rate at which individuals leave a habitat. Here, we consider a situation where defectors disperse at a constant rate  $Z_{D,i} = 1$ , whereas cooperators leave if they have been cheated  $\alpha = 3$  times in a row

$$Z_{C,i} = Z_{C,i}(C_i, D_i) = \left( \frac{D_i}{C_i + D_i} \right)^\alpha. \quad (6)$$

Exploring the model numerically (Fig. 1) we find that at low link strengths  $\delta$  (*i.e.* low diffusion rates) the system approaches a homogeneous stable state, where each patch harbors the same densities of cooperators and defectors (Figs. 1B, 1C; equilibrium densities are denoted by  $C_i^*, D_i^*$ ). In this example, defectors are the most abundant type in all habitat patches,  $C_i^* - D_i^* < 0$  for all  $i$  (Fig. 1B).

When the link strength is increased beyond a critical point then the homogeneous state becomes unstable and the system undergoes a bifurcation, and instead approaches a heterogeneous state (Figs. 1B, 1D) where the cooperators constitute a majority in one patch while they largely abandon the other.

### General theory

We now describe a general theory for the stability of homogeneous states in a broad class of games on arbitrary patch networks, using a master stability function approach [15, 16]. Consider a game with the following properties: *i*) the evolutionary/behavioral dynamics within a patch can be faithfully modeled by a system of differential equations, and *ii*) if played on a single patch the system will approach a stationary state. Now consider this game on a network of patches, where *iii*) patches are of identical quality, *iv*) links are bidirectional and lossless, and *v*) the emigration rate from a patch is proportional to the number of links. Note that these conditions do not exclude very high-dimensional systems, strong nonlinearities, strong selection in the behavioral or evolutionary dynamics, or complex decision rules (*e.g.* cross-diffusion, fitness- or habitat-dependent dispersal cues [14]).

Under the conditions above, at least one steady state exists where the communities in each patch are identical (*e.g.* Fig. 1C); we call these states *homogeneous*. In homogeneous states, community compositions are independent of spatial network topology and can be found, even for very large networks, simply by analyzing a patch in isolation (see *Supplementary Materials*). However, the stability of homogeneous states is sensitive to network topologies and thus stable homogeneous behavior may be possible on some patch networks, while instability may lead to heterogeneous behaviors emerging in others [15, 18–20].

The stability of homogeneous states can be computed from local linearizations of the dynamics captured by the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}$ . For a model with  $N$  variables per patch and  $M$  patches,  $\mathbf{J}$  has the dimension  $NM \times NM$ . However, the Jacobian is not an unstructured matrix, but instead intricately reflects the structure of the system, which we can make explicit by writing

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{L} \otimes \mathbf{C} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  is an  $N \times N$  identity matrix,  $\mathbf{P}$  is the Jacobian matrix for the game played on an isolated patch, the coupling-matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  is a Jacobian-like matrix that consists of partial derivatives of the emigration rates from one patch with respect to population sizes in that patch,  $\mathbf{L}$  is the weighted Laplacian matrix of the patch network, and  $\otimes$  is a Kronecker product [15, 16, 18].

A stationary state is stable if all eigenvalues  $\lambda$  of the Jacobian matrix have negative real parts. Using Eq. (7) these eigenvalues can be computed as

$$\lambda = \bigcup_n \text{Ev}(\mathbf{P} - \kappa_n \mathbf{C}) \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{Ev}$  returns the set of eigenvalues of a matrix and  $\kappa_n$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}$  [15] (*Supplementary Materials*). The beauty of this master stability function approach is that it separates the impact of spatial network structure from the effect of local dynamics. Specifically the spatial network structure can affect the eigenvalues of the system only via the Laplacian eigenvalues  $\kappa_n$ . Because the effect of space is thus encapsulated in  $\kappa_n$ , the remaining eigenvalue problem in eq. (8) is relatively easy because the relevant matrix only has the size  $N \times N$ .

We can now define the master stability function

$$S(\kappa) = \text{Ev}_1(\mathbf{P} - \kappa \mathbf{C}). \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{Ev}_1$  return the eigenvalue with the largest real part. In a specific network the homogeneous state is stable if  $S$  is negative for the set  $\kappa$  that describes the specific network topology. However, we can also interpret  $\kappa$  as an unknown parameter and read the master stability function as a general




Figure 2: The appearance of heterogeneous stationary states on arbitrary networks. **A.** Master stability function (eq. 9) of the example snowdrift game. A vertical grey line marks  $\kappa_{\text{crit}}$  for this game, above which spatial patterns emerge ( $\lambda_1 > 0$ ).

relationship between the structure of patch networks and dynamical instabilities leading to spatial heterogeneity.

To illustrate the master stability function let us return to the game from the introductory example, which we now consider on arbitrary networks described by a weighted adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , such that link weight between node  $i$  and  $j$  is  $A_{ij}$ . In this more general case the game is described by the following equations

$$\dot{C}_i = G_{C,i} - M_{C,i} - w_i E_{C,i} + \sum_j A_{ij} E_{C,i} \quad (10)$$

$$\dot{D}_i = G_{D,i} - M_{D,i} - w_i E_{D,i} - \sum_j A_{ij} E_{D,i}. \quad (11)$$

where  $w_i = \sum_j A_{ij}$  is the weighted degree of  $i$ .

Using the same parameters as before (Fig. 1) we find that the local Jacobian and the coupling matrix are

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.92 & -1.4 \\ 0.028 & -2.5 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.06 & 0.19 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

This leads to the master stability function (Fig. 2)

$$S(\kappa) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{1.13\kappa^2 + 3.33\kappa + 2.33} - 0.94\kappa - 3.42 \right) \quad (13)$$

We can see that  $S > 0$  on any network that has a Laplacian eigenvalue  $\kappa > 15.1346$ ; we refer to this as the critical  $\kappa$ , or  $\kappa_{\text{crit}}$ , which is specific to the game, but independent of the network structure on which the game is played.

For example a pair of nodes connected by a single link of weight  $\delta$  has a leading eigenvalue of  $\kappa_1 = 2\delta$ . This shows that the homogeneous state in our example game must become unstable on such an isolated link if  $\delta > 7.5673$ , which explains our previous observations (Fig. 1B).

The results from this section illustrate that the master stability function approach can be used to disentangle the impacts of game parameters from the impact of the topological structure of the underlying network.

## Impact of network motifs

There is a wealth of mathematical knowledge that links the Laplacian eigenvalues to specific network properties. Because the Laplacian is a symmetric matrix, it must have an eigenvalue  $\kappa$  that is greater or equal to the largest eigenvalue in any subgraph of the network [21]. Hence if a given motif in the network has an eigenvalue  $\kappa > \kappa_{\text{crit}}$ , the whole network must also have such an eigenvalue and the homogeneous state must be unstable.

The subgraph rule allows us to extend our results on isolated links in the network to any link in the network. We can for instance say that the homogeneous state is unstable if there is any link of strength  $\delta > \kappa_{\text{crit}}/2$ . Similar criteria can be constructed for any conceivable motif. For example a node that is connected to  $n$  other nodes via links with a strength of least  $\delta$  has an eigenvalue  $\kappa \geq (n + 1)\delta$ . This shows that the homogeneous state in our example game is definitely unstable if there is a node that has at least 15 links of strength 1 or more.

It is also possible to derive sufficient criteria for stability of the homogeneous state. For example Gershgorin's theorem implies that any Laplacian eigenvalue obeys  $\kappa \leq 2k_{\text{max}}$  where  $k_{\text{max}} = \max_j \sum_i A_{ij}$  is the maximum weighted node degree in the network [21]. Thus in the example game the homogeneous state is guaranteed to be stable if  $k_{\text{max}} < \kappa_{\text{crit}}/2$ .

The examples in the present section illustrate that one can straightforwardly derive topological stability criteria that link dynamical transitions to features of the network, such as the presence or absence of certain network motifs. Such criteria are particularly easy to formulate for games that are characterized by rising master stability functions, including our example system. As a next step we explore the conditions under which a game has this property.

## Shortwave instabilities in cooperation games

A distinctive feature of the example game is that it is unstable for sufficiently high values of  $\kappa$ . Drawing on an analogy with pattern formation in continuous space we call this behavior shortwave instability.

As pointed out in [15, 17, 18] there is a deep analogy between the master stability function on networks and the Turing instability in partial differential equations (PDEs). The master stability function equation becomes Turing's seminal approach if we replace the negative network Laplacian  $-L$  with the Laplace operator in continuous space. The eigenvalue  $\kappa$  can then be interpreted as a wave number. A rising master stability function shows that the instability is most pronounced at arbitrarily high wave numbers, i.e. arbitrarily short waves, which would be unphysical in PDE systems, but is meaningful in a network.

To explore when shortwave instabilities occur, consider that, except for some pathological cases, we can assume

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} \text{Ev}(\mathbf{P} - \kappa \mathbf{C}) = -\kappa \text{Ev}(\mathbf{C}). \quad (14)$$

as  $\mathbf{P}$  becomes negligible in comparison to  $\kappa \mathbf{C}$ . This shows that the shortwave instability occurs when the dispersal strategy is such that  $\mathbf{C}$  has a negative eigenvalue. For games with two types (C and D) the coupling matrix has the form.

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_C E_C & \partial_D E_C \\ \partial_C E_D & \partial_D E_D \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

At least one negative eigenvalue exists if either

$$0 > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}) = \partial_C E_C + \partial_D E_D \quad (16)$$

or

$$0 > \lambda_1 \lambda_2 = |\mathbf{C}| = \partial_C E_C \partial_D E_D - \partial_D E_C \partial_C E_D \quad (17)$$

One can think of the two terms in the first condition as the degree to which cooperators promote the emigration of cooperators ( $\partial_C E_C$ ) and vice versa for defectors. Hence the first condition is met

if cooperators suppress the emigration of cooperators strongly enough to overcome the effect of defectors promoting their own emigration.

Assuming that presence of defectors promotes the emigration of both cooperators and defectors we can write the second condition as

$$\frac{\partial_C E_C}{\partial_D E_C} < \frac{\partial_C E_D}{\partial_D E_D}. \quad (18)$$

The fraction on the right-hand side can be assumed to be negative or zero because the presence of cooperators should reduce defector emigration or leave it unchanged in reasonable models. By contrast the left hand side can be positive as  $\partial_C E_C$  can either be negative, due to retention of cooperators in a cooperative environment, or positive due to the mass-action effect leading to a positive scaling of cooperator emigration with cooperator numbers. However, the condition can again be satisfied if cooperators suppress their own emigration strongly enough.

Summarizing these results, we can say that shortwave instabilities are primarily expected in those systems where cooperators strongly (nonlinearly) increase the retention of other cooperators in their patch. Defector avoidance is a special case of this general condition.

### Value of forgiving dispersal strategies

To overcome the stabilizing effect of mass-action, the emigration rates need to be strongly nonlinear functions. In our example game, the rule that a cooperator leaves, when cheated  $\alpha$  times in a row, leads to factors  $[D/(C + D)]^\alpha$ . One can quickly verify that an overzealous dispersal strategy, where one leaves after being cheated for the first time, isn't nonlinear enough to destabilize the homogeneous state. Thus, in a world where everybody is eager to emigrate to avoid defectors, emigration is useless as the conditions would become identical in all nodes. By contrast, a more forgiving strategy where agents only disperse after having been cheated 10 times in a row leads to very nonlinear dispersal functions, which are likely to destabilize the homogeneous state. Thus, a forgiving dispersal strategy, may be rewarded indirectly by the formation of safe havens for cooperation.

We tested the counter-intuitive value of forgiving dispersal strategies in numerical experiments, where we considered a large number ( $10^7$ ) of feasible steady states in systems with different parameter values (see *Methods*). We focus only on systems where the homogeneous state is stable at sufficiently low values of coupling, and then ask how much the coupling strength has to be increased to trigger instability. The results show that more forgiving strategies, where cooperators endure more contiguous interactions with defectors before emigrating, consistently leads to instability at lower coupling strength, even as the benefits to cheating increase (Fig. 3). This provides further evidence that forgiving dispersal strategies favor formation of heterogeneous states.

### Formation of save havens for cooperation

So far we have shown that defector avoidance has no impact on the outcomes of the game unless certain thresholds are crossed, which can be linked to topological features of the underlying network. We now use simulations to explore the behavior beyond this threshold. For illustration we consider a 100-node random geometric graph, which provides a reasonable approximation for real networks of habitats and the dispersal connections between them [14]. The coupling strength  $\kappa$  is chosen for each simulation such that it exceeds the threshold value at which the homogeneous state becomes unstable.

Visual inspection of simulated metacommunities quickly reveals that some of the nodes become cooperator dominated. Moreover, these safe havens of cooperation seem to occupy locally well-connected nodes, but not the most highly-connected nodes in the whole network (Fig. 4A).

In network science the number of connections (degree centrality) is a relatively crude notion of the topological importance (centrality) of a node in the network. A more sophisticated metric is




Figure 3: Correlation between  $\kappa_{\text{crit}}$  and key parameters: the normalized temptation to defect,  $T/R$  and the tolerance of cooperators for consecutive defector encounters,  $\alpha$ . Points and error bars show means  $\pm 2$  S.E.M.

provided by adjacency-based spectral centrality, which is loosely related to Google’s PageRank [22] algorithm.

Analyzing an ensemble of 1000 network simulations (parameters as in Fig 1) reveals that the nodes of lowest centrality become defector dominated, whereas better connected nodes with a higher centrality can sustain a majority of cooperators. However, the most-central nodes in the network are a toss-up, containing almost equal populations of defectors and cooperators (Fig. 4B). Hence, at least in our example game, the locations where safe havens for cooperation form are highly connected nodes, but not the most-highly connected nodes.

## Discussion

We showed that ecologically motivated models of cooperation games on networks can be studied mathematically. In particular, the master-stability function approach from synchronization provides a powerful tool to explore when a particular game will lead to heterogeneous states, where spatial reciprocity becomes possible and safe havens for cooperation can be formed.

The work presented here revealed two main findings which some readers may find counter-intuitive. First, allowing cooperators to emigrate selectively, in response to defector density, does not always confer a direct benefit to the cooperator. Defector avoidance can only result in an increased payoff for cooperators if it is sufficiently strong to overcome a sharply defined threshold where the system leaves the homogeneous state. The master stability function approach allows us not only to compute these thresholds precisely, but to disentangle the effects of the game and the underlying network topology. This opens up a promising angle for future investigations on the impact of specific scenarios and specific network motifs.

Parameter	Interpretation	Range or value
$R$	Reward from mutual cooperation	$U(0.25, 2.5)$
$S$	$C$ reward when encountering $D$	$R - zR$ , where $z \sim U(10^{-2}, 1)$
$T$	$D$ award when encountering $C$	$zR$ , where $z \sim U(2, 7)$
$P$	Punishment from mutual defection	$S - zS$ , where $z \sim U(10^{-2}, 1)$
$\mu$	<i>per capita</i> mortality rate	$U(0, 1)$
$\alpha$	$C$ tolerance for consecutive $D$ encounters	(3, 12)

Table 1: Parameter definitions and ranges used to generate random games for Fig. 3.






Figure 4: **A.** Snapshots of dynamics on an example network with  $\kappa_1 > \kappa_{\text{crit}}$  (grey line in Fig. 2). Darker blues and reds correspond to numerical dominance in the steady state by cooperators or defectors respectively. Parameters as in Fig. 1. **B.** Simulations on 1000 random geometric graphs, showing the association between relative cooperators densities at equilibrium ( $C_i^* - D_i^*$ ) and patch eigenvector centrality (bin means  $\pm$  S.E.M.).

Our second major finding concerns the role of forgiving dispersal strategies in triggering short-wave instabilities. The shortwave instability is a genuine network effect that would be unphysical in continuous geometries. Based on our findings we expect this instability to occur particularly if the cooperators respond strongly nonlinearly to cooperation levels. Namely, the instability may be triggered by forgiving dispersal strategies where the cooperator only leaves a patch after being cheated several times in consecutive games. Therefore, forgiving dispersal strategies, that more accurately sample local conditions, may be far more beneficial than stricter responses. In many scenarios only the forgiving strategy will induce the heterogeneity in the system that ultimately creates safe havens for cooperation, whereas a stricter more immediate dispersal response to defection will result in maladaptive dispersal in a system of homogeneous patches.

One possible criticism may be that even in the heterogenous state, cooperation doesn't become widespread but mostly remains confined to some nodes which typically occupy central (but not most-central) positions in the network. We nevertheless believe that the formation of such hubs for cooperation can be an important stepping stone in the evolution of higher forms of cooperation and social complexity. Beyond the scope of the class of models explored here, the formation of local cooperation hubs may enable secondary processes, such as the formation of social norms and governance structures, which once established can help promote cooperative behavior in the rest of the network.

## References

- [1] Nowak, M. A. & May, R. M. Evolutionary games and spatial chaos. *Nature* **359**, 826 (1992).
- [2] Szathmary, E. & Smith, J. M. *The major transitions in evolution* (WH Freeman Spektrum Oxford, UK:, 1995).
- [3] Nowak, M. A. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *science* **314**, 1560–1563 (2006).

- [4] Von Neumann, J., Morgenstern, O. & Kuhn, H. W. *Theory of games and economic behavior (commemorative edition)* (Princeton university press, 1944).
- [5] Pennisi, E. On the origin of cooperation (2009).
- [6] Butler, S. & O'Dwyer, J. P. Cooperation and stability for complex systems in resource limited environments. *bioRxiv* 514018 (2019).
- [7] Hauert, C. & Doebeli, M. Spatial structure often inhibits the evolution of cooperation in the snowdrift game. *Nature* **428**, 643 (2004).
- [8] Ohtsuki, H., Hauert, C., Lieberman, E. & Nowak, M. A. A simple rule for the evolution of cooperation on graphs and social networks. *Nature* **441**, 502 (2006).
- [9] Li, X. *et al.* Punishment diminishes the benefits of network reciprocity in social dilemma experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 30–35 (2018).
- [10] Holyoak, M., Leibold, M. A. & Holt, R. D. *Metacommunities: spatial dynamics and ecological communities* (University of Chicago Press, 2005).
- [11] Leibold, M. A. & Chase, J. M. *Metacommunity Ecology* (Princeton University Press, 2017).
- [12] Levin, S. A. The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology* **73** (1992).
- [13] Durrett, R. & Levin, S. The importance of being discrete (and spatial). *Theoretical population biology* **46**, 363–394 (1994).
- [14] Gross, T. *et al.* Modern models of trophic meta-communities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **375**, 20190455 (2020).
- [15] Brechtel, A. & *et al.* Master stability functions reveal diffusion-driven pattern formation in networks. *Physical Review E* **97** (2018).
- [16] Pecora, L. M. & Carroll, T. L. Master stability functions for synchronized coupled systems. *Physical review letters* **80**, 2109 (1998).
- [17] Nakao, H. & Mikhailov, A. S. Turing patterns in network-organized activator–inhibitor systems. *Nature Physics* **6**, 544–550 (2010).
- [18] Segel, L. A. & Levin, S. A. Application of nonlinear stability theory to the study of the effects of diffusion on predator-prey interactions. In *AIP conference proceedings*, vol. 27, 123–152 (American Institute of Physics, 1976).
- [19] Levin, S. A. Dispersion and population interactions. *The American Naturalist* **108**, 207–228 (1974).
- [20] Levin, S. A. & Segel, L. A. Pattern generation in space and aspect. *SIAM Review* **27**, 45–67 (1985).
- [21] Anderson Jr, W. N. & Morley, T. D. Eigenvalues of the laplacian of a graph. *Linear and multilinear algebra* **18**, 141–145 (1985).
- [22] Page, L., Brin, S., Motwani, R. & Winograd, T. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical Report 1999-66, Stanford InfoLab (1999). URL <http://ilpubs.stanford.edu:8090/422/>. Previous number = SIDL-WP-1999-0120.
- [23] Sugden, R. *et al.* *The economics of rights, co-operation and welfare* (Springer, 2004).

## Acknowledgments

We thank U. Bhatt, A.M. Hein, B.T. Martin, S. Munch and A. Traulsen for helpful discussions. A.K.F. was supported by a research fellowship from the National Research Council of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics. F.C. is supported by the China Scholarship Council. S.A.L. is supported by the Army Research Office Grant W911NF-18-1-0325. T.G. was supported the Ministry for Science and Culture of Lower Saxony (HIFMB project) and the Volkswagen Foundation (grant number ZN3285).

## Supplementary Materials

The class of systems considered here have homogeneous stationary states where all nodes approach the same state regardless of the topology of the underlying spatial network (Figs. 1B & 1C). In these states the net biomass flows in and out of each patch must be equal, such that neither dispersal (selective or otherwise) nor network topology can affect population densities. In any homogeneous state, the densities of cooperators and defectors in any patch are therefore identical to densities in the nonspatial case [15] described by

$$\dot{C} = C \frac{RC + SD}{C + D} - \mu C(C + D) \quad (19)$$

$$\dot{D} = D \frac{TC + PD}{C + D} - \mu D(C + D). \quad (20)$$

Setting time derivatives to 0 in Eqs. 19 and 20, we find that the system has the three following homogeneous steady states that describe biomass densities across  $i$  identical patches: (i) only cooperators persist, with  $C_i^* = R/\mu$  and  $D_i^* = 0$ , (ii) only defectors persist, with  $C_i^* = 0$  and  $D_i^* = P/\mu$ , and (iii) a coexistence state of cooperators and defectors, with

$$C_i^* = \frac{(P - S)(PR - ST)}{\mu(P + R - S - T)^2}, \quad (21)$$

$$D_i^* = \frac{(R - T)(PR - ST)}{(P + R - S - T)^2}. \quad (22)$$

The coexistence state is only biologically feasible if  $C_i^* > 0$  and  $D_i^* > 0$ , which places conditions on the relative payoffs each type of player can receive from interactions. This holds under two sets of conditions. The first occurs when  $P > S$  and  $R > T$ . In these cases, the payoff from an interaction with a defector is larger for defectors while the payoff from an interaction with a cooperator is larger for cooperators. Alternatively, positivity occurs when  $P < S$  and  $R < T$ . This case includes the classical ‘‘snowdrift’’ game [23]: a cooperator meeting a defector pays the entire cost but still experiences the benefits, while a defector encountering another defector results in no benefit to either ( $P < S$ ). Meanwhile, a cooperator meeting another cooperator invests a fraction of the cost, while a defector meeting a cooperator gets the benefit for free ( $R < T$ ).

The within-patch Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  in the coexistence steady state is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(P-S)[R(P-R+S)+T(R-2S)]}{(P+R-S-T)^2} & \frac{(P-S)[P(S-2R)+S(R-S+T)]}{(P+R-S-T)^2} \\ \frac{(R-T)[P(T-2R)+T(R+S-T)]}{(P+R-S-T)^2} & -\frac{(R-T)[P(R+S+T)-2ST-P^2]}{(P+R-S-T)^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

which has eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{(P - S)(R - T)}{P + R - S - T}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{ST - PR}{P + R - S - T}. \quad (24)$$

Thus when  $P > S$  and  $R > T$ ,  $\lambda_2 > 0$  and the system is always unstable. By contrast, if  $P < S$  and  $R < T$ ,  $\lambda_2 < 0$  and so the state is stable as long as  $ST - PR > 0$ , such that  $\lambda_1 < 0$ . A stable homogeneous steady state, with coexistence of both types within each patch exists if and only if  $P < S$  and  $R < T$ .

To generate larger networks for simulations (Fig. 4), we randomly assign coordinates drawn from a uniform distribution  $\sim U(0, 1)$  to patches in a 2 dimensional space. Patches were then connected if the Euclidean distance between their coordinates fell below a value  $h = 0.195$ .

### A master stability approach

If we start in a homogeneous state we cannot observe a beneficial effect of defector avoidance unless the homogeneous state loses stability such that the system can depart from the homogeneous state

and spatial patterns begin to form. Such patterns are characterized by an unequal distribution of cooperators and defectors, which generally benefits cooperators.

To explore the stability of the homogeneous state we compute the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}$ , with a  $2N \times 2N$  dimension. The Jacobian of the network system in the compact form can then be expressed as

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{L} \otimes \mathbf{C}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  is identity matrix,  $\mathbf{L}$  is Laplacian matrix of the spatial network ( $M \times M$ , where  $M$  is the number of patches), and  $\mathbf{C}$  is the coupling matrix ( $N \times N$ , where  $N$  is the number of species). The Laplacian matrix is constructed by setting  $L_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij}$  and subtracting  $\mathbf{A}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the weighted adjacency matrix.

As the matrix has a block structure, its eigenvectors also have a similar structure [15]  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{q}$ , where  $\mathbf{v}$  is an  $N$ -dimensional vector and  $\mathbf{q}$  is an  $M$ -dimensional vector. Let  $\mathbf{v}$  be an eigenvector of  $\mathbf{L}$  with eigenvalue  $\kappa$ , such that  $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{v} = \kappa\mathbf{v}$ . Also, let  $\mathbf{q}$  be an eigenvector of  $\mathbf{P} - \kappa\mathbf{C}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Then,  $\mathbf{w}$  is an eigenvector of  $\mathbf{J}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$  as the following calculation shows:

$$\mathbf{J}\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{L} \otimes \mathbf{C}) \cdot (\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{q}) \quad (26)$$

$$= \mathbf{I}\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{P}\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{L}\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{C}\mathbf{q} \quad (27)$$

$$= \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{P}\mathbf{q} - \kappa\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{C}\mathbf{q} \quad (28)$$

$$= \mathbf{v} \otimes (\mathbf{P} - \kappa\mathbf{C})\mathbf{q} \quad (29)$$

$$= \mathbf{v} \otimes \lambda\mathbf{q} = \lambda(\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{q}) = \lambda\mathbf{w} \quad (30)$$

Since all eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{J}$  can be constructed in this way, the complete spectrum of  $\mathbf{J}$  is then

$$\text{Ev}(\mathbf{J}) = \bigcup_n \text{Ev}(\mathbf{P} - \kappa_n\mathbf{C}), \quad (31)$$

where  $\kappa_n$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}$  [15]. Eq. 31 shows an advantageous property of spatially-embedded system: the impact of spatial topology on system stability only enters through the Laplacian eigenvalues. Moreover, since every Laplacian eigenvalue  $\kappa_i$  generates a set of Jacobian eigenvalues which is independent of the other Laplacian eigenvalues, Eq. 31 defines a master stability function using only knowledge about the local system ( $\mathbf{P}$ ) with some minor modifications to account for spatial processes ( $\mathbf{C}$ ). This method therefore permits the fast computation of the leading Jacobian eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  which could be generated by a given Laplacian eigenvalue  $\kappa_n$ .

The resulting function  $S(\kappa) = \text{Re}[\lambda_{\max}(\kappa)]$  is then a master stability function for the meta-community. To achieve stability, all eigenvalues of the Jacobian need to have negative real parts, which means only when  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{J}) < 0$  and  $\text{Det}(\mathbf{J}) > 0$  simultaneously can the steady state be stable. Stability is lost if any Laplacian eigenvalue falls into a range where the master stability function is positive. This enables us to analyze the stability of the spatial reaction-diffusion system by first computing the spectrum of the Laplacian matrix.