

Plasticity and evolvability under environmental variability: the joint role of fitness-based selection and niche-limited competition

Eleni Nisioti
eleni.nisioti@inria.fr

Flowers Team, Inria and Ensta ParisTech
Bordeaux, France

Clément Moulin-Frier
clement.moulin-frier@inria.fr

Flowers Team, Inria and Ensta ParisTech
Bordeaux, France

ABSTRACT

The diversity and quality of natural systems has been a puzzle and inspiration for communities studying artificial life. It is now widely admitted that the adaptation mechanisms enabling these properties are largely influenced by the environments they inhabit. Organisms facing environmental variability have two alternative adaptation mechanisms operating at different timescales: *plasticity*, the ability of a phenotype to survive in diverse environments and *evolvability*, the ability to adapt through mutations. Although vital under environmental variability, both mechanisms are associated with fitness costs hypothesized to render them unnecessary in stable environments. In this work, we study the interplay between environmental dynamics and adaptation in a minimal model of the evolution of plasticity and evolvability. We experiment with different types of environments characterized by the presence of niches and a climate function that determines the fitness landscape. We empirically show that environmental dynamics affect plasticity and evolvability differently and that the presence of diverse ecological niches favors adaptability even in stable environments. We perform ablation studies of the selection mechanisms to separate the role of fitness-based selection and niche-limited competition. Results obtained from our minimal model allow us to propose promising research directions in the study of open-endedness in biological and artificial systems.

1 INTRODUCTION

A key feature of biological evolution is its open-ended nature [3, 8]. Understanding how such an apparently simple optimization procedure, based on variation and selection, can generate this impressive diversity of species varying in their morphological, behavioral or cultural repertoire has been a puzzle for several research communities – including evolutionary biology, artificial life (AL) and artificial intelligence (AI). An important driver of recent progress in our understanding of the emergence of open-endedness in artificial systems is that tasks and environments play a key role, complementary to that of the cognitive mechanisms that the AI community has been focusing on for decades [36]. Firm steps towards environments of increased complexity were taken under a family of techniques termed as autotutorials [31], where aspects of an artificial system such as its multi-agent dynamics [2, 23] and curriculum learning [39] are leveraged to automate the emergence of complexity rather than hand-engineer it. The generation of effective environments is today believed to be one of the pillars for progress in the field [5].

In natural systems, organisms facing environmental variability have two alternative adaptability mechanisms: (i) *plasticity*, which

denotes the ability of a single genotype to produce multiple phenotypes depending on environmental conditions, thus enabling its survival under environmental variability within its lifetime [1, 7]. Regulatory homeostasis [7], learning (including its socio-cultural aspect) [13] and intrinsic motivation [29] are examples of mechanisms that enable plasticity in natural systems (ii) *evolvability*, which refers to the ability of modifying the properties of the phenotype through the mutation and selection of genomes. Plasticity is intra-generation; although mechanisms supporting it can be inherited either culturally (e.g. through social norms and language) or genetically (e.g. morphology and cognitive abilities), behaviors that contribute to plasticity are acquired within one’s lifetime and are not transferred by genetic inheritance. Evolvability on the other hand is inter-generation; it can only act at the moment of reproduction. Both mechanisms are believed to come at a cost. Plasticity is associated with maintenance and production costs, described by tolerance curves as a fitness reduction in a plastic individual compared with a non-plastic individual [1, 18]. Evolvability, on the other hand, increases the probability of deleterious mutations [14, 25]. Both mechanisms are, thus, evolvable and emerge out of an evolutionary process that optimizes adaptability based on a trade-off of their associated costs and benefits [10, 13, 18].

A better understanding of the relationship between adaptability and environment can, thus, be approached by studying the selection pressures that different environmental dynamics impose on plasticity and evolvability. A plethora of theoretical models, data and computational studies has offered many hypotheses about this relationship. A consensus seems to be that adaptability disappears in stable environments, as it only incurs costs and no benefits [7, 16]. In particular, the drift-barrier hypothesis attributes the empirical observation that evolvability does not completely disappear but rather converges to a low value to genetic drift caused by the finiteness of population sizes [24]. Plasticity on the other hand is hypothesized to emerge when within-generation predictability is not too low to prohibit adaptation and between-generation predictability is not too high for innate mechanisms to suffice [18, 20]. Environmental variability in the form of extinction events or periodic variation has been associated with temporary increases in evolvability [21] and plasticity [16].

Despite this plethora of works, our current understanding of the interplay between environment and adaptability is not complete, arguably due to incompatibilities between studies that differ in their employed models and assumptions [4, 25]. Are the particularities of systems employing adaptability mechanisms so pronounced that one cannot hope for an abstract understanding of adaptability that

would enable the transfer of knowledge between them? Our objective with this work is to hint that this is not the case: as we show empirically, even a very simple evolutionary model can provide rich insights by taking into account the complex interactions between the heterogeneous mechanisms participating in evolutionary processes: environmental variability, genome properties, fitness-based selection and niche-limited competition. By positioning our observations alongside studies in human ecology and AI, we show that indeed the diversity of fields that could benefit from such studies is wide; it includes both natural and artificial systems.

In particular, in this work we attempt to provide a minimal model of the evolution of plasticity and evolvability and employ it to study its interplay with environmental variability. We study a wide range of conditions in an environmental model consisting of a climate function and multiple niches. We also analyze the joint effect of fitness-based selection and niche-limited competition and explicitly measure how the trade-off between plasticity and evolvability varies with the selection mechanism. We propose specific measures of phenotypic and genotypic diversity inspired from natural populations. Through an extensive empirical study we show, among others, that:

- (1) Plasticity does not disappear in stable environments under the condition that there is a sufficient number of niches and niche-limited competition.
- (2) Both fitness-based selection and niche-limited competition are necessary for survival in complex environments.
- (3) Different selection mechanisms give rise to different solutions to the plasticity-evolvability trade-off.

2 RELATED WORKS

In a recent computational study of the trade-off between evolvability and plasticity, populations of virtual cells employing a cellular homeostasis mechanism were shown to exhibit two distinct adaptation strategies: evolvability emerged when environmental variation was low, while plasticity dominated in environments varying with high frequency [7]. While an important step towards distinguishing these two mechanisms, this study did not take into account the presence of niches, studied a specific type of environmental variability and employed a domain-specific genotype to phenotype mapping.

A minimal model of the evolution of plasticity under environmental variability that follows either a pulse or a sinusoid form showed that plasticity emerges under environmental variability and completely disappears during stable periods [16]. The genome model considered did not allow evolvability to evolve, as the mutation rate was kept constant, and selection was fitness-based, with individuals competing across niches. This work proposed a geographical model of niches corresponding to different latitudes that is also employed in our work.

The environmental conditions that contribute to the emergence of evolvability have been widely studied by the AL community, where accelerating evolutionary optimization can prove vital for practical applications. Major extinction events, where niches disappear randomly, were shown to favor evolvable populations [4]. This type of extinction event is unnatural from a biological viewpoint; instead in our work niches disappear indirectly when their capacity,

dictated by a climate function, becomes zero. Reproduction within niches of limited capacity was shown to also favor evolvability, as evolvable individuals are capable of dispersing, and thus, face a higher effective capacity [22]. Reproduction within each niche did not take fitness into account, prohibiting the generalization of the conclusion to fitness-based selection mechanisms. Direct search for novelty in behavioral space is also known to favor evolvability [9]. Instead of explicitly optimizing for novelty, our analysis studies how it emerges as a byproduct of adaptability. In a recent proposal to view evolution as meta-learning, environmental variability and large population sizes were identified as necessary conditions for evolvability to evolve [12]. This study did not take into account the effect of niche-limited competition.

Studies of the effect of environmental dynamics on human evolution, a remarkably plastic species whose behavioral repertoire has largely inspired our study of artificial systems, point to the fact that early homos were exposed to a mixture of stable, variable and noisy climatic periods [27, 37]. The rich, multi-scale environmental dynamics arising in such settings are hypothesized to drive adaptability, manifested for example through dispersal patterns, increased mutation rates [17] and tool use [15]. The types of environmental variability examined in our work are largely inspired by the Pulsed Climate Variability framework [27], a notable attempt at unifying existing viewpoints of the interplay between environmental and population dynamics, such as the Red Queen [30] and the variability selection hypotheses [32]

3 MODELING AND METHODOLOGY

In this section we present our proposed model and methodology for studying the relationship between plasticity and evolvability in variable environments. We separately discuss our modeling of the environment and genome, the evolutionary algorithm and the metrics used to evaluate the population.

A population of $K \in \mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$ individuals evolves in an environment consisting of $N \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ niches for $G \in \mathcal{G} = \{1, \dots, G\}$ generations under selection mechanism S and genome model O .

3.1 Modeling the environment

An environment is characterized by two elements: (i) a number of niches N arranged in a simple latitudinal model: we consider a reference niche at $n = 0$, $N/2$ "northern" niches indicated with positive indexes $n \in (0, N/2]$ and $N/2$ "southern" niches with negative indexes $n \in [-N/2, 0)$ (ii) a climate function $L : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which describes the value of the environmental state of the reference niche $n = 0$ at a given generation g , i.e. $e_0^g = L(g)$. The environmental state of any niche n can then be determined as:

$$e_n^g = e_0^g + n \cdot \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

with ϵ a constant capturing the difference in terms of environmental state between adjacent niches. The schematic on the left of Figure 1 illustrates how the environmental state of each niche is computed based on our model.

The environmental state plays two roles: it is used to determine the fitness of the individual based on its genome, as described in Section 3.2 and determines the capacity of a niche c_n^g as: $c_n^g = e_n^g C_N$,




Figure 1: (Left) The latitudinal model we employ to describe how the environmental state varies across niches: there is a single climate function (dashed arrow) L evolving with generations that has a vertical offset equal to $\epsilon \cdot n$ for each n . Thus niches with higher index n have higher states, and therefore, higher capacity. (Right) Modeling plasticity as a normal distribution $N(\mu_k, \sigma_k)$. A non-plastic individual (k) has small σ_k and a high peak at their preferred niche, while a plastic individual (k') has large σ_k and a lower peak at their preferred niche. Fitness in a given niche n is computed as the probability density function of the distribution at the environmental state e_n . This figure also illustrates the costs and benefits of plasticity, assuming that $\mu_k = \mu_{k'}$. If $e_n = \mu_k$ (the actual environmental state is identical to the preferred niche of both individuals) the plastic individual has lower fitness (cost of plasticity). If $e_n \gg \mu_k$ (the actual environmental state differs significantly from the preferred one) the plastic individual has higher fitness (benefit of plasticity).

where C_N is termed the climate-independent capacity. In order to ensure that the maximum population size is independent of the number of niches we define $C_N = C_{\text{ref}}/N$, where C_{ref} , the reference capacity, is equal to the desirable maximum population size. Thus, higher environmental states can support larger populations and are termed “high-quality”: for a given climate function, “northern” niches have higher quality, while environments where the climate function takes higher values have higher quality in all niches. An assumption of this model is that there is spatial smoothness, i.e., niches closer to each other have more similar environmental states.

3.2 Modeling the genome

We adopt tolerance curve to design a genome that can track both directional selection and selection for plasticity [16, 26]. Tolerance curves describe the fitness of a genotype as a function of the environmental state. Specifically, a tolerance curve is a normal distribution with mean μ_k^g , indicating the environmental state of highest fitness for an individual, which we refer to as the preferred state, and a standard deviation σ_k^g that captures how quickly the fitness of the genome drops as the environmental state varies from its preferred state. Genomes with large σ_k^g are indicative of plastic individuals, as these can tolerate a larger variety of environmental states. On the right of Figure 1 we can see the tolerance curves of a plastic and a non-plastic individual. As the sum of the area under the curve is always equal to one, this model captures the cost of plasticity: when a plastic and a non-plastic individual have identical preferred state μ_k^g , the non-plastic individual has higher fitness in the environmental state $e_n = \mu_k^g$ (see section 3.3 for the definition of the

fitness). The genome o_k^g also includes the mutation rate r_k^g , thus $o_k^g = [\mu_k^g, \sigma_k^g, r_k^g]$. Upon reproduction the genome mutates as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k^{g+1} &= \mu_k^g + \mathcal{N}(0, r_k^g) \\ \sigma_k^{g+1} &= \sigma_k^g + \mathcal{N}(0, r_k^g) \\ r_k^{g+1} &= r_k^g + \mathcal{N}(0, r_k^g) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(x, y)$ denotes a normal distribution with mean x and variance y . This genome model, which we refer to as R_{evolve} , captures the co-evolution of plasticity (through σ) and evolvability (through r). In our experiments, we also try an ablation of this model, $R_{\text{no-evolve}}$, where the mutation rate is constant (i.e., $r_k^g = r_0 \forall g, \forall k$), a situation corresponding to a non-evolvable population.

3.3 Selection mechanism

At the end of a generation individuals are selected for sexual reproduction based on the selection mechanism S and their offspring form the next generation. To compute the fitness of an individual k in generation g we first detect the niches in which it can survive as:

$$n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad e_n^g \in [\mu_k^g - 2\sigma_k^g, \mu_k^g + 2\sigma_k^g], \quad (3)$$

and compute its fitness in each one of them as $f_{k,n}^g = pdf(\mu_k^g, \sigma_k^g, e_n^g)$, where pdf denotes the value of the normal probability density function with mean μ_k^g , and variance σ_k^g at location e_n^g . An individual’s fitness is the average over the fitnesses in the niches it can survive in.

Our proposed selection mechanism entails two independent assumptions inspired from natural evolution: (i) *niche-limited competition*: when deciding which individuals will reproduce, we study each niche independently; (ii) *fitness-based selection*: within a niche, individuals produce offspring until its capacity is filled, with fitter individuals being chosen with higher probability. Only individuals that can survive in a niche are considered for reproduction within it and an individual can reproduce in at most one of the niches it can survive in (we keep track of whether an individual reproduces once and do not consider it in other niches). We refer to this mechanism as NF-selection.

We also experiment with two ablations of this mechanism: (1) under F-selection, competition is population-wide and individuals are selected for reproduction based on their fitness. This model is often termed as survival of the fittest. (2) under N-selection, individuals reproduce only within their own niche and are chosen with equal probability until its capacity is filled. This model is commonly known as limited-capacity.

We present the pseudocode describing how evolution takes place in Algorithm 1, which contains the initialization of the population and environment and their updates at each generation based on the climate function L , and Algorithm 2, which provides more details on how reproduction differs depending on the selection mechanism.

Algorithm 1 evolution

```

1: Input:  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{G}, \epsilon, L, C_{\text{ref}}, S$ 
2:  $\mathcal{K}.\text{initializeGenomes}()$ 
3:  $e_0^0 = L(0)$ 
4:  $\mathcal{N}.\text{initializeNiches}(C_{\text{ref}}, e_0^0, \epsilon)$ 
5: for  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  do
6:    $e_0^g = L(g)$  ▷ Climate function transitions
7:    $\mathcal{N}.\text{updateNiches}(C_{\text{ref}}, e_0^g)$  ▷ Update environmental state of
   all niches based on new climate
8:    $\mathcal{K}.\text{reproduce}(\mathcal{N}, S, g)$ 
9: end for

```

3.4 Evaluation metrics

To evaluate the population we compute the following metrics at the end of each generation g :

- (1) $\bar{\mu}^g$, the value of the preferred environmental state, averaged over the population. This metric is useful for detecting whether the population is well-adapted: if $\bar{\mu}^g$ tracks the form of the climate function, then the population is well-adapted. Otherwise, it is insensitive to environmental change, which comes at a fitness cost due to our genome model. Note that when there is a single niche, we expect $\bar{\mu}^g$ to track e_0^g (with some delay and noise), while in the case of multiple niches, there may be a vertical offset if the population inhabits northern niches.
- (2) $\bar{\sigma}^g$, the value of the standard deviation σ^g for preferred environmental states, averaged over the population. We refer to this metrics as the population-average plasticity.
- (3) \bar{r}^g , the mutation rate r component averaged over the population, which denotes the population-average evolvability.

Algorithm 2 reproduce

```

1: Input:  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{N}, S, g$  ▷  $S \in \{\{N\}, \{F\}, \{N, F\}\}$ 
2:
3: if  $N \in S$  then ▷ Niche-limited competition
4:   population =  $\{\mathcal{K}.\text{survive}(n) \mid n \in \mathcal{N}\}$  ▷ See Eq 3
5:   capacity =  $\{c_n^g \mid n \in \mathcal{N}\}$  ▷ See Section 3.1
6: else ▷ Only fitness-based selection
7:   population =  $\{\mathcal{K}\}$  ▷ no niche-limited competition, see
   Section 3.3
8:   capacity =  $\{\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} c_n^g\}$ 
9: end if
10: if  $F \in S$  then ▷ Fitness-based competition
11:   select="fitness-based" ▷ Selection of the fittest
12: else ▷ No fitness-based competition
13:   select="random" ▷ Random selection
14: end if
15:
16: for  $p, c \in \text{zip}(\text{population}, \text{capacity})$  do ▷ For each population
   with its own capacity
17:   size = 0
18:   while size <  $c$  do
19:     offspring =  $p.\text{mate}(\text{select})$  ▷ See Section 3.3
20:     offspring.mutate() ▷ Eq 2
21:     size ← size + 1
22:   end while
23: end for

```

- (4) $X^g = \sum_k X_k^g$, the number of extinctions. We denote the survival of individual k in niche n at generation g as a binary variable:

$$s_{k,n}^g = (e_{n,g} \in [\mu_k^g - 2\sigma_k^g, \mu_k^g + 2\sigma_k^g]) \quad (4)$$

Thus, an individual goes extinct ($X_k^g = 1$) if $\sum_n s_{k,n}^g$ is zero and survives ($X_k^g = 0$) if $\sum_n s_{k,n}^g$ is positive.

- (5) population survival A^g , the percentage of generations that a run of our algorithm survived for. Values smaller than 1 are indicative of a mass extinction.
- (6) V^g , the diversity of the population defined as the standard deviation of the population's genes, formally:

$$V = \sigma_{\mu^g} + \sigma_{\sigma^g} + \sigma_{r^g} \quad (5)$$

This metric captures the genetic diversity of the population.

- (7) D^g , the dispersal of the population, computed as the number of niches over which at least one individual survives for a temporal window of at least w generations. Formally, $D_w^g = \sum_{n=1}^N d_{n,w}^g$, where $d_{n,w}^g$ denotes the persistence of the population in a given niche for the required time window and is computed as

$$d_{n,w}^g = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{g'=g-w}^g s_n^{g'} = w \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Population	Environment	Evaluation
K , population size	$L : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, climate function	$\bar{\mu}^g$, population-average ideal environmental state
μ_k^g , mean of tolerance curve	N , number of niches	$\bar{\sigma}^g$, population-average plasticity
σ_k^g , standard deviation of tolerance curve	$e_0^g = L(g)$, reference environmental state	\bar{r}^g , population-average evolvability
r_k^g , mutation rate	$e_n^g = e_0^g + \epsilon n$, environmental state	X^g , extinction events
$\sigma_k^g = [\mu_k^g, \sigma_k^g, r_k^g]$, genome	$C_{\text{ref}} = K_{\text{max}}$, reference capacity	D^g , dispersal (see Section 3.4 for definition)
$O \in [O_{\text{evolve}}, O_{\text{no-evolve}}]$, genome evolution model	$C_N = C_{\text{ref}}/N$ climate-independent capacity	$V^g = \sigma_{\mu_g} + \sigma_{\sigma_g} + \sigma_{r_g}$, (genotypic) diversity
	$c_n^g = e_n^g \cdot C_N$ climate-dependent capacity	A , population survival
	$S \in [\text{F-selection}, \text{N-selection}, \text{NF-selection}]$, selection mechanism	
	ϵ , vertical offset between adjacent niches	

Table 1: Notation used to indicate features of the population, environment and evaluation metrics: Super-script g is the generation index, while sub-scripts k and n are indexes for individuals and niches respectively.

where s_n^g is indicates the survival of at least one individual in a given niche and is computed as

$$s_n^g = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_k^K s_{k,n}^g > 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with $s_{k,n}^g$ defined in Eq. (4). As this metric arises from the interaction of the genome and environment, we can view it as measure of phenotypic diversity.

A summary of our notation for all parameters characterizing the population, environment and evaluation metrics can be found in Table 1.

4 RESULTS

We present empirical results on the behavior of a population following our proposed model of NF-selection with the R_{evolve} genome in a variety of environments that differ in the form of the climate function L , which is either stable, sinusoidal or noisy and the number of niches N , sampled in the range $[1, 100]$. The reference capacity is $C_{\text{ref}} = 1000$ and the distance between niches is $\epsilon = 0.01$. We denote values after convergence with an asterisk super-script. We perform ablation studies of the selection mechanism by also experimenting with F-selection and N-selection and the genome model, by comparing to $R_{\text{no-evolve}}$. For each experiment we present the mean of the evaluation metrics and 95% confidence intervals computed over 5 independent runs.

4.1 Evolving in a stable environment

We define a stable environment as one where the climate function, and hence, the reference environmental state is constant, i.e. $e_0^g = e_0^0, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}$. The environmental state of the different niches is, therefore, also constant and equal to $e_n^g = e_0^0 + n \cdot \epsilon$. We experiment with high-quality environments ($e_0^0 > 7.5$) which can support a large population distributed among all available niches, low-quality environments ($e_0^0 \leq 0.5$) where the capacity is low with the majority of niches being unable to support any individuals and medium-quality environments ($0.5 < e_0^0 < 7.5$) where some of the niches become uninhabitable only for large enough N .

4.1.1 Low-quality environments with multiple niches favor plasticity.

Figure 2 presents the population-average plasticity after convergence, $\bar{\sigma}^*$, under NF-selection using the O_{evolve} genome model (populations converged in all simulations after around 100 generations)




Figure 2: Population-average plasticity after convergence ($\bar{\sigma}^*$) in a constant environment under NF-selection and genome R_{evolve} .

under various environmental conditions and number of niches. We observe that when there is a single niche ($N = 1$) plasticity converges to a very low value regardless of the reference environmental state. This is intuitive as the cost of plasticity captured by our genome model renders individuals with the smallest σ_k^* the fittest. This agrees with previous studies in constant environments [16] (note that F-selection is identical with NF-selection when there is a single niche). However, the picture differs significantly when there are multiple niches and low-quality environments: as an individual can reproduce in any of the niches it can survive in, higher plasticity means higher chances of reproduction, which counteracts the cost of plasticity. As the quality of environments increases the benefit of plasticity disappears: non-plastic individuals dominate the available niches even though some individuals choose to disperse. In contrast to these interesting dynamics of plasticity, we observed that the population-average evolvability remained very low ($\bar{r}^* < 10^{-30}$) in all conditions. This observation is inline with the intuition that mutations disappear in stable environments as they incur fitness costs [14, 25].

4.1.2 Niche-limited competition is necessary for plasticity to persist.

In Figure 3 we compare how the different selection mechanisms behave under different environmental conditions when there is




Figure 3: Population-average plasticity ($\bar{\sigma}^*$) and dispersal (D^*) after convergence in a constant environment under different selection mechanisms and environmental conditions for $N = 100$ niches: F-selection leads to considerably lower plasticity and dispersal.

a large number of niches ($N = 100$). We observe that under F-selection plasticity and dispersal are very low, while N-selection and NF-selection exhibit a similar behavior. This suggests that a key element in maintaining plasticity in a constant environment is combining a large number of niches with niche-limited competition and explains why our conclusions disagree with existing studies in constant environments that only consider F-selection in a single niche [16]. Also, the high dispersal under N-selection agrees with studies hinting that niche-limited competition that ignores fitness leads to high phenotypic diversity [22]. However, our study further clarifies that, when given an option to adapt through plasticity or evolvability, both N-selection and NF-selection opt for plasticity. This phenomenon was not captured by models that considered evolvability as the only adaptability mechanism [22].

4.1.3 F-selection leads to more extinction events. In Figure 4 we see that populations under F-selection suffer much higher extinction rates compared to populations under NF-selection. This is the case only for evolvable populations (O_{evolve}): if we don't allow evolvability to disappear but instead keep it constant at $r_k^g = 0.001 \forall g, k$, then extinctions persist both for F-selection and NF-selection. The behavior for N-selection is similar to NF-selection suggesting that high extinctions in evolvable populations are due to lack of niche-limited competition: indeed as we saw in Figure 3, individuals under F-selection have very low plasticity ($< 10^{-8}$) and occupy a single niche. Thus, mutations, even though occurring with low probability can slowly shift an individual away from its niche and lead to its extinction. Note that the distance between niches is too large ($\epsilon = 0.01$) for a mutation to transfer a non-plastic individual to another niche. The trend of increasing extinctions with the reference environmental state is consistent for different values of N and is a result of the fact that the population size increases.




Figure 4: Extinction events (X^*) in a constant environment under different selection mechanisms and genome models for $N = 100$ niches.

4.1.4 Diversity is highest under NF-selection. In Figure 5 we observe that diversity V^* , defined in Eq. 5, under NF-selection increases as the environmental state increases, while the opposite happens for N-selection, which also exhibits higher variance. Under F-selection, the population exhibits no diversity. We therefore conclude that both fitness-based selection and niche-wide competition are necessary for diversity to be high. A closer inspection of the constituents of diversity reveals that the high diversity of NF-selection is due to the σ_{μ^g} component. Specifically, $\sigma_{\mu^*} = 0.2849$, $\sigma_{\sigma^*} = 0.0015$, $\sigma_{r^*} = 4 \cdot 10^{-7}$ for NF-selection and $\sigma_{\mu^*} = 0.01$, $\sigma_{\sigma^*} = 0.00243$, $\sigma_{r^*} = 4 \cdot 10^{-10}$ for N-selection. Thus, NF-selection and N-selection may both exhibit the same dispersal (see Fig 3) but their reasons are different: for NF-selection it's a combination of high plasticity ($\bar{\sigma}$) and high diversity in the preferred niches (σ_{μ^g}), while for N-selection it is solely due to the, slightly higher than under NF-selection, plasticity.

4.2 Evolving under periodic variability

We model periodic variability as a sinusoid with period T_e and amplitude A_e that dictates the evolution of the reference environmental state $e_{0,g}$. Based on our environmental model described in Section 3.1 and illustrated in Figure 1, all niches experience changes simultaneously but the exact environmental state has an offset that depends on the latitude. Compared to the previous analysis of stable environments, behaviors here exhibit more rich dynamics. To better analyze them, we first present results on survival A (defined in Section 3.4) and then monitor how specific metrics evolve with generations.

4.2.1 Well-adapted plastic and evolvable individuals emerge under NF-selection only when the number of niches is sufficient. In Figures 6 and 7 we observe the ability of the population to survive when we vary the amplitude of oscillations (A_e) and number of niches (N) respectively, for different values of the oscillation period T_e . We can draw various conclusions from these results: (i) increasing the number of niches enables the population to survive longer in




Figure 5: Diversity (V^*) in a constant environment: comparison between QD-selection, Q-selection and D-selection for genome G and $N = 100$ niches.




Figure 6: Survival (A) as the percentage of generations without a mass extinction under NF-selection with genome R_{evolve} , $N = 100$ niches and varying period T_e and amplitude A_e .

environments changing more frequently (ii) survival is guaranteed for small-amplitude variations ($A_e = 0.2$) regardless of their frequency (iii) in the case of large-amplitude variations ($A_e = 8$) high frequency does not allow the population to adapt at all (iv) low frequency leads to low evolvability that eventually leads to a mass extinction. This case can be paralled to a major extinction event [21] (v) In the case of medium-amplitude ($A_e = 1$) survival is possible only under low-frequency variation

In Figure 8, we further analyze the ability of the population to survive by looking at how the evaluation metrics evolve with increasing generations. We observe that the population manages to track the environmental variability by keeping both plasticity and evolvability high, with oscillations in plasticity and evolvability occurring at twice the period of variability T_e , as they increase at




Figure 7: Survival (A) as the percentage of generations without a mass extinction under NF-selection with genome R_{evolve} , $A_e = 4$ and varying period T_e and Number of niches.

both transition points. Also, extinctions are highest during the peak of e_0 , which are also the points of lowest plasticity and evolvability. Diversity is slightly lower during the low peaks of e_0 . We should note that we did not find high-frequency cases where the population reacted solely through plasticity or low-frequency cases where the population adapted solely through evolvability, as indicated by previous studies [7].

4.2.2 Maladapted plastic individuals emerge under F-selection and N-selection. To understand the effect of the selection mechanism on the course of evolution, we present similar results under F-selection and NF-selection in Figure 9. As these mechanisms can avoid mass extinctions only for very small amplitudes and periods, we present results for $A_e = 0.2$ and $T_e = 46$. As we saw before under NF-selection, the reason why slow variations are detrimental is that they lead to low values of evolvability. Figure 9 further shows some similarities between the two mechanisms: in both of them evolvability becomes very small and adaptation essentially stops: we see that $\bar{\mu}$ does not track the sinusoid. Also, diversity is very low. On the other hand, the two mechanisms exhibit significant differences: under F-selection there is no dispersal and plasticity is low. Under D-selection, dispersal is significantly higher ($D = 75$) and plasticity is higher. This suggests that under F-selection the population survives because specialists occupy a few niches, while under N-selection the population survives by occupying as many niches as possible.

4.3 Evolving in a noisy environment

We model a noisy environment as one where the reference state e_0^g takes values sampled from a normal distribution with standard deviation σ_N and mean e_0^g . We experiment with various environmental conditions with $\sigma_N \in [0.05, 0.2, 0.4, 0.8]$ and $e_0^g \in [0.2, 1, 2, 4]$.

4.3.1 Under NF-selection populations can tolerate higher uncertainty. In Figure 10 we present how the survival ability of the population varies with the level of noise under different selection mechanisms




Figure 8: Evolution under NF-selection with genome R_{evolve} , $N = 100$ niches, $T_e = 750$ and $A_e = 8$.

for an environment with $N = 40$ niches and $e_0^0 = 2$. We observe that, under NF-selection the population can survive much larger noise levels and that F-selection cannot survive even the lowest levels of noise. By also analyzing the same environmental conditions for $N = 1$ we observed only extinctions. This is because a single niche prohibits the survival of plastic individuals due to the cost of plasticity. We also observed that for $N = 40$ and $e_0 = 0.2$ only populations under NF-selection and N-selection survived for the minimum examined noise level ($\sigma_N = 0.05$). This is also not surprising as in low-quality environments with high uncertainty niches disappear (their capacity becomes 0) with high probability so that dispersal cannot offer an advantage.

In Figure 11 we observe how different evaluation metrics evolve under different selection mechanisms for $N = 40$ niches, $\sigma = 0.2$ and $e_0^0 = 2$. We observe that: (i) under F-selection the population experiences a mass extinction early on because its plasticity decreases (ii) under N-selection the population converges to high plasticity and low evolvability. The population does not track the variations of e_0 and dispersal is moderate with about half of the niches being inhabited (iii) under NF-selection the population has both high plasticity and evolvability, as well as maximum dispersal




Figure 9: Evolution under Q-selection (blue) and under D-selection (orange) with genome R , 100 niches, $T_e = 46$ and $A_e = 0.2$.




Figure 10: Survival under different selection mechanisms and varying noise levels for $e_0^0 = 2$ and $N = 40$ niches with genome O_{evolve} .




Figure 11: Evolution under different selection mechanisms with genome R_{evolve} , $N = 40$ niches, $\sigma = 0.2$ and $e_0^0 = 2$.

and high diversity. Thus, in line with other studies [7], we find settings where plasticity and evolvability behave differently (N-selection). However, we observe that a well-adapted population needs to increase both its plasticity and evolvability to deal with uncertainty.

5 DISCUSSION

We have designed a minimal model of the evolution of plasticity and evolvability and studied the complex interactions between different types of environmental variability and selection mechanisms. Despite its simplicity, experiments with our proposed setup have revealed numerous insights about how optimal evolutionary strategies arise. We have in particular shown that the decision on whether to include niche-limited competition and the number of niches gives rise to qualitatively different solutions to the plasticity-evolvability trade-off, in turn affecting important population properties such as diversity and dispersal. We hope that our work sheds light into the existing plethora of related works and will prove useful in future studies of both artificial and natural systems.

We believe that a particularly promising application area for studies following the nature of this work can be found in the family of Quality-Diversity algorithms [33]. Similarly to our proposal, this community lays emphasis on the benefits of combining niche-limited competition and fitness-based selection; however, as our empirical results indicate, parameters such as the number and quality of niches, as well as the form and presence of environmental variability show great qualitative impact and can potentially act as a curriculum for the emergence of adaptation.

Interpreting our observations from the perspective of hypotheses from human ecology can also reveal the potential of such simple models for studying existing hypotheses. In particular: (i) the observation that low-quality environments favor plastic individuals, while high-quality environments favor non-plastic individuals (see Section 4.1.2) hints to the turnover pulse hypothesis [38]; (ii) the observation that adaptability is favored by abrupt transitions (see Section 4.2.1) and high variability (see Section 4.3.1) hint to the variability selection hypothesis [32]. We should note that these hypotheses share a common model of environmental variability characterized by a large diversity of niches [27].

It is important to also note the assumptions made by our study and how future work in AI and AL can help overcome its limitations. First, tolerance curves assume that plasticity comes at a cost, an assumption that is often questioned in natural systems; we believe that studies with artificial systems can reveal whether such costs indeed arise. Second, our model does not capture the mechanism of species co-adaptation [34] and can therefore not offer insights on how the dynamics of arms races are influenced by resource availability, as proposed by the Red Queen hypothesis [30]. Then, our model assumes that there are no constraints on plasticity; we believe that studies with a more complex genotype to phenotype mapping that employ different adaptation mechanisms to ensure plasticity can reveal mechanism-specific limits that will extend the conclusions reached in this work. Finally, we believe that progress in open-endedness requires a better understanding of niching in recent simulation environments employed by the deep reinforcement learning community [6, 28, 35], as environmental properties, such as the number of niches and smoothness, play a key role in adaptability.

Finally, as recently suggested by a conceptual framework for modeling open-ended skill acquisition in both artificial and natural systems [28], the effect of environmental variability on adaptation mechanisms is only part of the overall picture. To understand the impressive complexity of the human ecological niche, we need to also take into account multi-agent dynamics and culture, which modulate the processes of selection and niche construction [11, 28]. We believe that exploring these links in multi-agent reinforcement learning simulations environments that take sociality into account [19] will further improve our understanding of adaptation mechanisms.

Acknowledgements. This research was partially funded by the Inria Exploratory action ORIGINS (<https://www.inria.fr/en/origins>) as well as the French National Research Agency (<https://anr.fr/>, project ECOCURL, Grant ANR-20-CE23-0006). This work also benefited from access to the HPC resources of IDRIS under the allocation 2020-[A0091011996] made by GENCI.

REFERENCES

- [1] Josh R. Auld, Anurag A. Agrawal, and Rick A. Relyea. 2010. Re-evaluating the costs and limits of adaptive phenotypic plasticity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277, 1681 (Feb. 2010), 503–511. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.1355>
- [2] Bowen Baker, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Todor Markov, Yi Wu, Glenn Powell, Bob McGrew, and Igor Mordatch. 2020. Emergent Tool Use From Multi-Agent Autocurricula. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkxpxJBKwS> tex.ids: Baker2019 arXiv: 1909.07528.
- [3] Gillian R. Brown, Thomas E. Dickins, Rebecca Sear, and Kevin N. Laland. 2011. Evolutionary accounts of human behavioural diversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 366, 1563 (Feb. 2011), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0267>
- [4] Luis-Miguel Chevin, Russell Lande, and Georgina M. Mace. 2010. Adaptation, Plasticity, and Extinction in a Changing Environment: Towards a Predictive Theory. *PLoS Biology* 8, 4 (April 2010), e1000357. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000357>
- [5] Jeff Clune. 2020. AI-GAs: AI-generating algorithms, an alternate paradigm for producing general artificial intelligence. *arXiv:1905.10985 [cs]* (Jan. 2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.10985> arXiv: 1905.10985.
- [6] Karl Cobbe, Oleg Klimov, Chris Hesse, Taehoon Kim, and John Schulman. 2019. Quantifying Generalization in Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 97)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov (Eds.). PMLR, Long Beach, California, USA, 1282–1289. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/cobbe19a.html>
- [7] Thomas D. Cuypers, Jacob P. Rutten, and Paulien Hogeweg. 2017. Evolution of evolvability and phenotypic plasticity in virtual cells. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 17, 1 (Dec. 2017), 60. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-017-0918-y>
- [8] Charles Darwin. 1859. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Natural Selection of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- [9] Stephane Doncieux, Giuseppe Paolo, Alban Laflaquière, and Alexandre Coninx. 2020. Novelty Search makes Evolvability Inevitable. *arXiv:2005.06224 [cs]* (May 2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.06224> arXiv: 2005.06224.
- [10] D. J. Earl and M. W. Deem. 2004. Evolvability is a selectable trait. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101, 32 (Aug. 2004), 11531–11536. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0404656101>
- [11] Manfred Eppe and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer. 2021. Intelligent Behavior Depends on the Ecological Niche. *KI - Künstliche Intelligenz* (Jan. 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-020-00696-1>
- [12] Kevin Frans and Olaf Witkowski. 2021. Population-Based Evolution Optimizes a Meta-Learning Objective. *arXiv:2103.06435 [cs]* (March 2021). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.06435> arXiv: 2103.06435.
- [13] Cameron K Ghalambor, Lisa M Angeloni, and Scott P Carroll. [n. d.]. Behavior as Phenotypic Plasticity. ([n. d.]), 19.
- [14] Antoine Giraud, Ivan Matic, Olivier Tenaillon, Antonio Clara, Miroslav Radman, Michel Fons, and François Taddei. 2001. Costs and Benefits of High Mutation Rates: Adaptive Evolution of Bacteria in the Mouse Gut. *Science* 291, 5513 (2001), 2606–2608. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1056421> arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1056421>
- [15] Matt Grove. 2011. Speciation, diversity, and Mode 1 technologies: The impact of variability selection. *Journal of Human Evolution* 61, 3 (Sept. 2011), 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2011.04.005>
- [16] Matt Grove. 2014. Evolution and dispersal under climatic instability: a simple evolutionary algorithm. *Adaptive Behavior* 22, 4 (Aug. 2014), 235–254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059712314533573>
- [17] Kelley Harris. 2015. Evidence for recent, population-specific evolution of the human mutation rate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, 11 (March 2015), 3439–3444. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418652112>
- [18] Timothy D. Johnston. 1982. Selective Costs and Benefits in the Evolution of Learning. In *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. Vol. 12. Elsevier, 65–106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3454\(08\)60046-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3454(08)60046-7)
- [19] Grgur Kovac, Rémy Portelas, Katja Hofmann, and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer. 2021. SocialAI 0.1: Towards a Benchmark to Stimulate Research on Socio-Cognitive Abilities in Deep Reinforcement Learning Agents. *CoRR* abs/2104.13207 (2021). arXiv:2104.13207 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13207>
- [20] Robert Tjarko Lange and Henning Sprekeler. 2021. Learning not to learn: Nature versus nurture in silico. *arXiv:2010.04466 [cs, q-bio]* (March 2021). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.04466> arXiv: 2010.04466.
- [21] Joel Lehman and Risto Miikkulainen. 2015. Extinction Events Can Accelerate Evolution. *PLOS ONE* 10, 8 (Aug. 2015), e0132886. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132886>
- [22] Joel Lehman and Kenneth O. Stanley. 2013. Evolvability Is Inevitable: Increasing Evolvability without the Pressure to Adapt. *PLoS ONE* 8, 4 (April 2013), e62186. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062186>
- [23] Joel Z Leibo, Edward Hughes, Marc Lanctot, and Thore Graepel. 2019. Autocurricula and the emergence of innovation from social interaction: A manifesto for multi-agent intelligence research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00742* (2019).
- [24] Michael Lynch. 2011. The Lower Bound to the Evolution of Mutation Rates. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 3 (Jan. 2011), 1107–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evr066>
- [25] Michael Lynch, Matthew S. Ackerman, Jean-Francois Gout, Hongan Long, Way Sung, W. Kelley Thomas, and Patricia L. Foster. 2016. Genetic drift, selection and the evolution of the mutation rate. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 17, 11 (Nov. 2016), 704–714. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2016.104>
- [26] Michael Lynch and Wilfried Gabriel. 1987. Environmental Tolerance. *The American Naturalist* 129, 2 (1987), 283–303. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284635> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1086/284635>
- [27] Mark A. Maslin, Susanne Shultz, and Martin H. Trauth. 2015. A synthesis of the theories and concepts of early human evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370, 1663 (March 2015), 20140064. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0064> Publisher: Royal Society.
- [28] Eleni Nisioti, Katia Jodogne-del Litto, and Clément Moulin-Frier. 2021. Grounding an Ecological Theory of Artificial Intelligence in Human Evolution. In *NeurIPS 2021 - Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems / Workshop: Ecological Theory of Reinforcement Learning*. virtual event, France. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03446961> Submitted paper.
- [29] Pierre-Yves Oudeyer, Frédéric Kaplan, and Verena V. Hafner. 2007. Intrinsic Motivation Systems for Autonomous Mental Development. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 11, 2 (April 2007), 265–286. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEVC.2006.890271> Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation.
- [30] Paul N Pearson. 2001. *Red Queen Hypothesis*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1038/npg.els.0001667> arXiv:<https://novele-coronavirus.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1038/npg.els.0001667>
- [31] Remy Portelas, Cédric Colas, Lilian Weng, Katja Hofmann, and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer. 2020. Automatic Curriculum Learning For Deep RL: A Short Survey. *arXiv:2003.04664 [cs, stat]* (May 2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.04664> arXiv: 2003.04664.
- [32] Richard Potts. 2013. Hominin evolution in settings of strong environmental variability. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 73 (Aug. 2013), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2013.04.003>
- [33] Justin K. Pugh, Lisa B. Soros, and Kenneth O. Stanley. 2016. Quality Diversity: A New Frontier for Evolutionary Computation. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 3 (July 2016). <https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2016.00040>
- [34] Ricard Solé. 2022. Revisiting Leigh Van Valen’s “A New Evolutionary Law” (1973). *Biological Theory* (Jan. 2022), s13752–021–00391–w. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13752-021-00391-w>
- [35] Joseph Suarez, Yilun Du, Phillip Isola, and Igor Mordatch. 2019. Neural MMO: A Massively Multiagent Game Environment for Training and Evaluating Intelligent Agents. *arXiv:1903.00784 [cs, stat]* (March 2019). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.00784> arXiv: 1903.00784.
- [36] Open Ended Learning Team, Adam Stooke, Anuj Mahajan, Catarina Barros, Charlie Deck, Jakob Bauer, Jakub Sygnowski, Maja Trebacz, Max Jaderberg, Michaël Mathieu, Nat McAleese, Nathalie Bradley-Schmiege, Nathaniel Wong, Nicolas Porcel, Roberta Raileanu, Steph Hughes-Fitt, Valentin Dalibard, and Wojciech Marian Czarnecki. 2021. Open-Ended Learning Leads to Generally Capable Agents. *CoRR* abs/2107.12808 (2021). arXiv:2107.12808 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.12808>
- [37] Martin H. Trauth, Mark A. Maslin, Alan L. Deino, Annett Junginger, Moses Lesolyia, Eric O. Odada, Daniel O. Olago, Lydia A. Olaka, Manfred R. Strecker, and Ralph Tiedemann. 2010. Human evolution in a variable environment: the amplifier lakes of Eastern Africa. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 29, 23–24 (Nov. 2010), 2981–2988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2010.07.007>
- [38] Elisabeth S. Vrba. 1985. Environment and evolution: alternative causes of the temporal distribution of evolutionary events. *South African Journal of Science* 81 (1985), 229–236.
- [39] Rui Wang, Joel Lehman, Jeff Clune, and Kenneth O. Stanley. 2019. Paired Open-Ended Trailblazer (POET): Endlessly Generating Increasingly Complex and Diverse Learning Environments and Their Solutions. *arXiv:1901.01753 [cs]* (Feb. 2019). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.01753> arXiv: 1901.01753.