

Evolutionary game selection creates cooperative environments

Onkar Sadekar,¹ Andrea Civilini,^{2,3} Jesús Gómez-Gardeñes,^{4,5} Vito Latora,^{2,3,6} and Federico Battiston¹

¹*Central European University Vienna, Vienna 1100, Austria*

²*School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom*

³*Dipartimento di Fisica ed Astronomia, Università di Catania and INFN, Catania I-95123, Italy*

⁴*Department of Condensed Matter Physics, University of Zaragoza, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain*

⁵*GOTHAM lab, Institute of Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), University of Zaragoza, 50018 Zaragoza, Spain*

⁶*Complexity Science Hub Vienna, A-1080 Vienna, Austria*

The emergence of collective cooperation in competitive environments is a well-known phenomenon in biology, economics and social systems. While most evolutionary game models focus on the evolution of strategies for a fixed game, how strategic decisions co-evolve with the environment has so far mostly been overlooked. Here, we consider a game selection model where not only the strategies but also the game can change over time following evolutionary principles. Our results show that co-evolutionary dynamics of games and strategies can induce novel collective phenomena, fostering the emergence of cooperative environments. When the model is taken on structured populations the architecture of the interaction network can significantly amplify pro-social behaviour, with a critical role played by network heterogeneity and the presence of clustered groups, distinctive features observed in real-world populations. By unveiling the link between the evolution of strategies and games for different structured populations, our model sheds new light on the origin of social dilemmas ubiquitously observed in real-world social systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Evolutionary Game Theory (EGT) combines game theory with Darwinian principles of natural selection and has made substantial contributions to diverse fields such as behavioural economics, social science, and biology [1–5]. Traditionally, EGT focuses on a population of players involved in a fixed game, evolving strategies over time based on individual fitness [6–9]. Fitness is generally considered a growing function of the player’s payoff, and it depends on the game and strategies of interacting players. This approach has yielded valuable insights into social and biological interactions, particularly in the context of social dilemmas—a widely recognized framework for investigating cooperation. In a social dilemma, each member of a group faces a choice: to cooperate or defect. Cooperation benefits the group but comes at an individual cost, while defectors enjoy the collective benefits without incurring any personal sacrifice. Classic examples of social dilemmas include the Prisoner’s Dilemma and the Snowdrift Game [2, 4].

When applied to understanding human behaviour and puzzling aspects of social interactions, the usual well-mixed approach of classical evolutionary game theory fails, and complex networks are used to describe patterns of interactions among players [6–10]. This approach has proven instrumental in examining dynamical processes on real social networks, where players interact with their neighbours in a network structure [11–14]. The concept of “centrality” of a player in a network, quantifying its importance or influence, has been explored to understand the spread of information, the diffusion of innovations, and the formation of social norms [15]. Moreover, traditional EGT models commonly rely on static, globally-defined payoff matrices [16, 17]. This simplification fails

to account for the reality that individual players engage in multiple social contexts and scenarios—each contributing to their overall fitness and subject to change over time.

In the last few years, these ideas have begun to emerge in the literature of evolutionary game theory. For instance, models based on stochastic games have been proposed to describe situations where players are in heterogeneous or periodically switching game environments [18–24]. However, many of these studies consider only a limited number of available environments, lack a generalized approach to defining the different environments and deal with game changes as a random process only, thus neglecting mechanisms leading to the selection of these environments [23, 25–34]. Thus, fundamental questions regarding how players’ strategies and game environments mutually adapt to one another remain unanswered.

In this work we propose a new framework in which evolutionary dynamics acts both on strategies and game environments. This holistic perspective allows us to analyze how strategies and environments mutually co-evolve over time leading to the emergence of cooperative environments. Furthermore, we identify that the topological properties of social interaction networks play a crucial role in shaping individual behaviour. Thus, our framework encompasses a comprehensive exploration of both intrinsic (behavioural) and extrinsic (contextual) factors that contribute to the emergence of pro-social behaviour and social dilemmas.

The outline of the paper is the following. In Section II we introduce the evolutionary model and explore its application to social dilemma games. We then look at the results of our model in a well-mixed population and networked structures in Section III. Finally, we summarize our main findings and give some future directions in Sec-




FIG. 1: Games classification. Each player is assigned one pair of values (T_i, S_i) from the game diamond. The equations for the boundaries of each game are derived from the inequalities between the payoffs. Here we set $\alpha = 4$, and $\beta = 2$.

tion IV.

II. MODEL

A. Individual payoff matrices

Let us consider two-player games where each agent can choose between two strategies. Traditionally, symmetric games, in the context of social dilemmas have been described by the following payoff matrix,

$$\begin{array}{c} C \quad D \\ \begin{array}{c} R \quad S \\ T \quad P \end{array} \end{array} \quad (1)$$

where, C and D represent respectively the two available strategies: cooperation and defection.

In particular, when facing another cooperator, a cooperator receives a payoff of R (termed “reward”), while against a defector, the payoff is S (referred to as “sucker’s payoff”). Conversely, a defector earns a payoff of T , “temptation”, when facing a cooperator, and P , “penalty”, when facing another defector.

The ordering of the entries of the payoff matrix defines four different types of games, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prisoner's Dilemma (PD): } & T > R > P > S \\ \text{Snowdrift (SD): } & T > R > S > P \\ \text{Stag-hunt (SH): } & R > T > P > S \\ \text{Harmony Game (HG): } & R > T > S > P \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In particular, we notice that for each game, either $T > R$ or $T < R$ and $S > P$ or $S < P$, leading to four distinct quadrants in the T - S phase space. In our framework, differently from the classical approach where just one game (i.e. a single payoff matrix) is taken into account, we consider a distribution of games. To do so we associate to each player i a randomly generated game/payoff matrix. However, if we define different games by generating the entries of the payoff matrix completely at random, the total payoff (i.e. the sum of the payoff matrix entries) for each game will, in general, be different. This introduces a bias, where the players associated with the games with a larger total payoff are favoured. Since in our model not only the strategies but also the games evolve, this bias will lead the evolutionary dynamics towards a trivial outcome where the whole population plays the game with the largest total payoff (as we verified numerically). In our model, we removed this bias by considering games described by payoff matrices where the matrix entrances (i.e. the payoffs) are drawn from symmetric distributions, and their sum (total payoff) is fixed. This is achieved by using the following payoff matrix to define the game associated with each player i :

$$\begin{array}{c} C \quad D \\ \begin{array}{c} \alpha - T_i \quad S_i \\ T_i \quad \beta - S_i \end{array} \end{array} \quad (3)$$

where $T_i \in [\beta/2, \alpha - \beta/2]$ and $S_i \in [\beta - \alpha/2, \alpha/2]$ are continuously distributed as shown in Fig. 1.

In this way, the sum of the elements in each column of the payoff matrix (Eq. 3) is equal to $R + T = \alpha$ for the first column, and to $S + P = \beta$ for the second column. As a consequence, for fixed values of α and β the total payoff (sum of all matrix entries) is a constant equal to $\alpha + \beta$. By varying the values of T_i and S_i we can define all four games. In particular, we substitute the expressions $R = \alpha - T$ and $P = \beta - S$ into the payoff inequalities given by Eqs. 2. This allows us to derive the conditions for the different social dilemmas, while adhering to the constraint of a constant total payoff:

1. Prisoner’s Dilemma (PD): $T > \alpha/2$ and $S < \beta/2$ and $S > T + \beta - \alpha$
2. Snowdrift (SD): $T > \alpha/2$ and $S > \beta/2$ and $S < \alpha - T$
3. Stag-hunt (SH): $T < \alpha/2$ and $S < \beta/2$ and $S > \beta - T$
4. Harmony Game (HG): $T < \alpha/2$ and $S > \beta/2$ and $S < T$

We notice that it is necessary $\alpha > \beta$ for the existence of T and S , solutions of the system of inequalities defining each game. By representing these conditions in the T - S space we obtain a “games diamond” as shown in Fig. 1.




FIG. 2: Fraction of cooperators $\rho(t)$ over time in a well-mixed population for (a) $p_g = 0$, (b) $p_g = 0.01$, and (c) $p_g = 0.1$. The solid lines denote the average while the shaded region is the standard error over 40 independent runs of the co-evolutionary game dynamics. Here we set $p_s = 1$, $N = 1024$, and $k = 4$.

B. Co-evolutionary game dynamics

Let the state of player i be represented by $\Omega_i = (g_i, s_i)$. Each player i within the population is distinctly identified by the game g_i linked to it and its chosen strategy s_i , which can be either cooperation C or defection D . As we saw before, given fixed values of α and β , the game g_i is wholly delineated by the payoffs T_i and S_i as presented in the payoff matrix Eq. 3. Henceforth, g_i will denote both the game and its corresponding payoff matrix.

The system evolves by agents replicating strategies s_i and games g_i from one another through an asynchronous update process [35]. At each time step we randomly select a focal player f and a model player m . We studied the evolutionary dynamics both for well-mixed populations, where each player can interact with all the other players, and for structured populations, where the players are represented as the nodes of a network and they interact if an edge connects them.

In particular, while in a well-mixed scenario the model player is randomly chosen from the entire population, in a structured population the model player is randomly drawn from the neighbours of the focal one.

The focal (respectively model) player collects its total payoffs π_f (π_m) by playing with each of its opponents. In structured populations, the focal player (with total payoff π_f) and the model player (with total payoff π_m) interact with their k_f and k_m neighbours, respectively. In well-mixed populations, they engage with k randomly selected agents. Each player participates in two games against every opponent j : one using their own payoff matrix g_f or g_m , and another using the opponent's payoff matrix g_j . The focal player updates its strategy through a two-phase stochastic pairwise comparison process, through which he/she can adopt the game and the strategy of the model player.

The state update process has two phases. First, we determine whether the game, the strategy, or both will be updated: the game is selected for an update with probability p_g , and the strategy is selected with an independent probability of p_s . Note that the case $p_g = 0$, $p_s = 1$ recovers the usual evolutionary game dynamics where only the strategies evolve. Then, the adoption of the model

game and/or strategy occurs with a probability that increases with $\pi_m - \pi_f$, the payoff difference between the model and focal players. In particular, the probability of adoption is described by the so-called Fermi function [11, 36–38]:

$$\Pi = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w(\pi_m - \pi_f))}, \quad (4)$$

where w governs the strength of selection. Note that the Fermi update rule is not deterministic and (especially for low values of w) the focal player can adopt games and strategies from the model player even in the case when $\pi_m < \pi_f$. Thus, at each step of the evolutionary dynamics, there are 4 possible transitions from the original state of the focal player $\Omega_f(g_f, s_f)$, to a new state where both the strategy and the game can be those of the model player, each occurring with the following probabilities:

$$\Omega_f(g_f, s_f) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \Omega_f(g_m, s_m) & \text{with } p_s \cdot p_g \cdot \Pi^2 \\ \Omega_f(g_m, s_f) & \text{with } p_g \cdot \Pi (1 - \Pi p_s) \\ \Omega_f(g_f, s_m) & \text{with } p_s \cdot \Pi (1 - \Pi p_g) \\ \Omega_f(g_f, s_f) & \text{with } (1 - \Pi p_s)(1 - \Pi p_g) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

We repeat the simulation step until the system reaches a (quasi) stationary state in which we compute the relevant macroscopic order parameters. In stochastic processes featuring absorbing states, quasi-stationary methods are employed to identify the system's stable states [39–41]. Should the system transition into an absorbing state, the quasi-stationary methodology reverts it to a prior state, weighted by the duration spent in that state. This approach yields a distribution skewed towards more frequently visited states. Previous research has shown that the local maxima of this skewed distribution asymptotically approaches the stable fixed point inherent to the system's stochastic dynamics [42–44].

III. RESULTS

We analyze the outcome of the co-evolutionary dynamics of games and strategies on different population struc-

tures. We first consider a well-mixed population of players, showing how the propensity to change the game, p_g , affects the system's steady state. In particular, we look at the fraction of cooperators ρ as a function of time. Next, we consider the case of structured populations, where the interactions among players are represented as a network. In this way, we explore the impact on the model dynamics of fixed neighbourhoods (namely *network reciprocity* effects), spatial homophily of games, and the correlations between the states of the agents and their placement in the network.

A. Well-mixed population

We consider a well-mixed population where we assign a game chosen uniformly at random from the game's diamond in Fig. 1 to each player. We start our analysis of the model dynamics with the case $p_g = 0$ and $p_s = 1$. In the rest of the paper we always choose $p_s = 1$ unless stated otherwise. In Fig. 2(a) we observe that for $p_g = 0$, independently of the initial fraction of cooperators, the trajectories converge to a stationary state where the population cooperates roughly half of the time. Thus, no matter the initial number of cooperators in the system, when $p_g = 0$ we always find players cooperating roughly half of the time. The error bars of the plot denote the standard error over 40 runs for each ρ_0 .

In contrast to the scenario of $p_g = 0$, a slight increase of p_g breaks down the symmetry of the evolutionary outcome under changes in the initial configuration. For instance, even for a very small value of $p_g = 0.01$ in Fig. 2(b), we observe a variety of quasi-stationary states in which the final density of cooperators strongly depends on the initial levels of pro-social behaviour. When p_g is further increased the former effects becomes more pronounced and (see Fig. 2(c) for $p_g = 0.1$) trajectories seem to bifurcate in two sets based on the number of initial cooperators. In particular, when the initial fraction of cooperators $\rho_0 = 0.5$, we observe that the cooperation level remains the same. However, if cooperators are in the minority, the system tends to eliminate cooperators while, when we start with a majority of cooperators, cooperation prevails in the long run.

To shed more light on this effect we define $\rho_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \rho(t) \rangle$ as the time-averaged cooperators' density in the long time limit and explore the dependence of ρ_∞ as a function of ρ_0 for various p_g values. In Fig. 3 we illustrate the aforementioned symmetry breaking phenomenon that occurs when $p_g > 0$. In particular, as soon as $p_g > 0$ we observe that there is a critical initial fraction of cooperators of $\rho_0 \approx 0.5$ needed to have a majority of cooperators in the steady state of the system. Moreover, as p_g increases the curves ρ_∞ depend more and more non-linearly on ρ_0 , resembling a step function when $p_g \rightarrow 1$. In this limit of strong game selection the form of the curves ρ_∞ pinpoint a reinforcement effect in which slight bias towards cooperation (defection) in the




FIG. 3: Final fraction of cooperators ρ_∞ as a function of the initial cooperators' density ρ_0 for various values of p_g , the probability of selection of game update. The parameters are $p_s = 1$, $N = 1024$, and $k = 4$.

initial configuration leads to a dynamical reinforcement of cooperators (defectors).




FIG. 4: Game selection in well-mixed populations. (a) Surviving games in a well-mixed population for various values of initial cooperators. Blue points denote initial conditions with fewer cooperators than defectors, while red dots denote more initial cooperators. (b) Surviving cooperative games fraction Φ_∞ as a function of ρ_0 for the same values of p_g . The parameters are $p_s = 1$, $N = 1024$, and $k = 4$.

Now we analyze the effects of co-evolutionary dynamics in game selection when $p_g > 0$. In particular, in




FIG. 5: Stationary state cooperation ρ_∞ as a function of ρ_0 for (a) $p_g = 0.1$ and (b) $p_g = 1$ for different structured populations. Simulations on well-mixed, lattices, random regular graphs and scale-free networks are for populations of $N = 1024$ individuals and $p_s = 1$.

Fig. 4(a), we show the distribution in the T - S plane of the surviving games, where the colours denote the number of initial cooperators, ρ_0 , of the corresponding realization. First, we observe that the quasi-stationary state consists primarily of players playing the SH but also PD and HG depending on ρ_0 . Moreover, it is interesting to notice that the surviving games are densely distributed near the corners of the phase space. Additionally, we see a smooth transition of surviving games from PD-SH to HG-SH as a function of ρ_0 . Fewer initial cooperators lead to games closer to a prisoner's dilemma which has full defection as the Nash equilibrium. On the other hand, an initial majority of cooperators brings the system closer to the Harmony game which has full cooperation as the Nash equilibrium.

Finally, we analyze in depth the dependence of the selected games as a function of p_g and ρ_0 . The game played by each individual i , g_i , is defined by the values of T_i and S_i and can be classified as cooperative or competitive. To this aim, we classify a game g_i as cooperative if the associated Nash equilibrium (mixed or pure) has a majority of cooperators, otherwise g_i is regarded as competitive. In particular, a cooperative game holds when $S > T - 1$. Figure 4(b) shows the fraction of cooperative games (environments) Φ_∞ among the surviving games as a function of ρ_0 for different values of $p_g > 0$. It is interesting to see that the curves are quantitatively very similar to the trend of ρ_∞ shown in Fig. 3, implying a strong correlation between the selected games and strategies for all values of p_g .

In conclusion, the presence of a co-evolutionary dynamics in well-mixed populations provides a way out for the survival of cooperation. However, this effect requires that $\rho_0 \approx 0.5$, which is an unrealistic critical mass of initial cooperators to achieve pro-social behaviour. In the next section, we show how the presence of structured population can enhance the pro-social behaviour at a lower cost.

B. Structured populations

Well-mixed populations are not the best representation of real-world systems, since individuals do not interact at random, but according to well-defined structural patterns. Networks constitute a natural framework for analysing these interaction paradigms. Here, we study the impact of different network topologies and features found in real-world systems on the model dynamics.

As explained above, the use of well-mixed population prevents repeated interactions between players since model players are chosen at random by each focal agent in each time step. However, when considering networked populations the neighbours of the focal agent are fixed in time representing a limited information horizon that affects the update of both strategies and games. In the context of evolutionary game dynamics it is widely known that networked interactions provide a structural way to sustain cooperation through various possible mechanisms such as punishing those who defect, clustering the cooperators together, reinforcement of pro-social behaviour [8, 9, 12, 13, 26, 45–47]. This effect, also known as ‘network reciprocity’, can lead to pro-social behaviour even in situations where, without network structure, cooperation can not be sustained.

Inspired by this phenomenon, we look at how a structured population can result in an enhancement of cooperative behaviour in the context of evolutionary game selection. Specifically, we are interested in how interacting with fixed neighbours and the structure of different network topologies change the stationary state compared to a well-mixed population. In the next part, we will explore how clusters of similar types of players (in our case having identical strategies and games) can emerge and how the targeted placement of cooperators on heterogeneous networks can amplify pro-social behaviour.




FIG. 6: Surviving games on 2D square lattices for initial conditions with clustered or random games and $\rho_0 = 0.5$. Initial and final snapshots of (a), (b) randomly allocated games and (d), (e) clustered games on a lattice of size 32×32 . (c), (f) The sizes of the largest connected clusters for each game and the density of cooperators averaged over 100 runs in lattices. Here, $p_g = p_s = 1$.

1. The effect of different network structures

As we have shown previously, cooperators' density in the stationary state is highly correlated to the surviving game. Hence, from now on we only show the fraction of cooperators in the stationary state, ρ_0 , since the trend for surviving cooperative games is very similar. Figure 5 shows the curves ρ_∞ for various network structures and two values of p_g . Specifically, we consider well-mixed populations (dark green curve), 2D square lattices (yellow), random regular networks (light green), and scale-free networks with $\gamma = 2.5$ (red). While in the first three cases all the players interact with exactly 4 other agents in each round, in scale-free networks the average degree is set to $\langle k \rangle = 4$.

For the smallest value of p_g (Fig. 5(a)), well-mixed populations showcase a sigmoidal curve with the onset of cooperation around $\rho_0 \approx 0.4$. However, for structured populations, ρ_∞ is consistently higher than that of well-mixed populations when we start from a minority of initial cooperators. In particular, we notice that for lattices and random regular graphs, we can get a majority of cooperators with 20% or fewer players starting as cooperators. Interestingly, scale-free networks show a smaller cooperative value than the other two graphs and, even more, its pro-social behaviour become even lower than that of well-mixed populations when we start with a majority of cooperators.

The former picture changes dramatically when game selection is fully activated, $p_g = 1$, as shown in Fig. 5(b). Differently from the previous case, when $p_g = 1$ random regular networks exhibit a very similar trend to well-mixed populations. On the other hand, lattices even though sustain cooperation better than random regular networks in this case, are far from their performance as

boosters of cooperation as for $p_g = 0.1$. In contrast, scale-free networks increase the level of cooperative behaviour with respect to the former scenario and, at variance with the other two graphs, do not exhibit any sharp transitions in the level of cooperation, showing a cooperative level of $\rho_\infty \approx 0.75$ over for most of ρ_0 values.

In summary, the former results indicate that networks boost pro-social behaviour, elevating the cooperation level in the population. Interestingly, smaller but non-zero values of p_g increase the cooperative behaviour further in homogeneous graphs than in the case of large p_g values. In contrast, heterogeneous networks support cooperative behaviours better for large values of p_g showing rather constant trends of the curves ρ_∞ . These results point to a balance between the propensity of changing game and the heterogeneity of interaction patterns.

2. Clustering games on a 2D lattice

In the next two subsections, we focus on analysing the structural organization of agents on the interaction backbone provided by the graph to gain a deeper understanding of the role of structure in co-evolutionary game dynamics. We start by examining 2D lattices, first investigated in the context of evolutionary games by Nowak and May [4], as these structures can be easily represented as players on top of a plane, allowing us to easily visualize and investigate how spatial correlations affect the emergence of collective behaviour [28, 48–51].

Figure 6 depicts the initial and final snapshots of a 2D lattice when, initially, individual games are randomly placed games, panel (a), or clustered, panel (d). Since we consider square lattices with periodic boundary conditions, all players are structurally equivalent and there

are no boundary effects. In both cases, exactly half the players are cooperators, located randomly in the network.

When games are randomly placed, the Stag-hunt and the Harmony games dominate the final configuration of the lattice, featuring large clusters. In this particular example, clusters of the Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) game are also observed. However, when the games are initially clustered on the lattice, the small PD clusters disappear, while the average sizes of connected clusters for the Stag-hunt game and the Harmony game increase. The density of cooperators is further increased when games are clustered. Notably, the Snowdrift game always goes extinct, regardless of the initial configuration.

We quantify the spatial segregation of the games by defining Φ_{game}^{GCC} for a particular 'game' as the size of the largest connected cluster of players adopting that game in the quasi-stationary state, normalized by the total number of players. Correspondingly, $\langle \Phi_{game}^{GCC} \rangle$ is defined as the average of Φ_{game}^{GCC} over 100 independent runs, and error bars denote the standard error. From panels Fig. 6 (c) and (f) it becomes clear that HG and SH games prevail and coexist in a balanced way.

In conclusion, clustering games on a lattice seems to promote the prevalence of cooperative environments. Moreover, while cooperators' density is generally higher on a lattice compared to structures without spatial correlations, game clustering further amplifies the selection of cooperation-friendly environments. This behaviour is important since it further corroborates the effect of homophily in real-world systems [52, 53].

3. Targeted placement of cooperators

Multiple empirical investigations have revealed the presence of heterogeneous and power-law degree distributions in social networks [54, 55]. A heterogeneous degree distribution implies the presence of *hubs*, nodes with a high degree. Such nodes with high degrees play a central role in the dynamics taking place on the network by effectively disseminating information, opinions, and behaviours throughout the network [11, 13]. Here, we explore the effect of the strategic initial placement of a small fraction of cooperators (less than or equal to 0.005 times the size of the population) on the evolution of pro-social behaviour. In particular, we consider two cases: (i) cooperators are initially positioned on the hubs of the network, (ii) cooperators are initially positioned on the leaves (i.e., nodes with small degree) of the network. In addition, we investigate how changing the level of heterogeneity of the network affects the co-evolutionary dynamics of the system for the different placement strategies mentioned above.




FIG. 7: Cooperation levels in scale-free networks for different initial placements of cooperators for two values of p_g . (a)-(b) A small fraction of cooperators (0.001-0.005 times the size of the population) is initially placed on the hubs. (c)-(d) Same fraction of cooperators is placed on the leaves.

Figure 7 shows, for two different values of p_g , the effect of strategically placing cooperators in scale-free networks as a function of their heterogeneity, captured by the exponent γ of the power-law degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$. In particular lower the value of γ the more heterogeneous the network and vice versa [55]. The top row entries are for the strategic placement of cooperators on the hubs, while the bottom row plots are for cooperators on leaves (lowest-degree nodes). For a small probability of game updating, $p_g = 0.1$, placing cooperators on the hubs ensures a very high level of cooperation across all values of γ (Fig. 7(a)). For example, starting with just one cooperator among 1024 players leads to a final count of approximately 800 cooperators ($\approx 80\%$). When game updating is always active, $p_g = 1$, and cooperators are placed on the hubs, cooperation levels for a similar initial cooperative mass decrease as the heterogeneity of the graph reduces (increasing γ), as illustrated in Fig. 7(b).

On the other hand, with $p_g = 0.1$ and a few cooperators on leaves, the levels of cooperative behaviour are very low (yet non-zero). As γ increases, meaning the degree distribution becomes less heterogeneous, there is an uptick in cooperation levels, but these never reach a strong majority (i.e. $\rho_\infty \lesssim 0.5$) (Fig. 7(c)). Similarly, with $p_g = 1$ and cooperators on leaves, the system always leans towards a majority of defectors, showing no significant change due to the value of γ (Fig. 7(d)).

Put together, the collective behaviour of surviving games and strategies depends heavily on complex network structures such as scale-free networks and the presence of strategy-network position correlations. In addition, increasing p_g nullifies the effect of the hubs in determining if cooperation is enhanced or diminished with respect to the heterogeneity of the network.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In recent decades, evolutionary game theory has provided valuable insights into understanding why agents choose cooperation despite personal incentives to defect. However, most existing studies focus on the evolution of strategies for specific, globally defined and static payoff matrices, disregarding changing environments and game conditions. Although some recent works have considered game heterogeneity through stochastic formulations, a comprehensive framework explaining the origin and emergence of these games and the dynamic relationship between games and strategies has remained elusive.

Our work contributes to bridge the former gap by introducing a co-evolutionary framework where both strategies and games co-evolve and undergo evolutionary selection. We propose a simple model for game competition with various types of games ensuring a constant total payoff for all agents. By adjusting the propensity to change the game (p_g) while maintaining a fixed probability of changing strategies (p_s), we discover fundamental changes in the system's evolution in well-mixed populations. In particular, even a small probability of switching games leads to a bifurcation of the stationary state, depending on the critical initial mass of cooperators. Additionally, we observe that the system tends to select more cooperative environments when there are enough initial cooperators, and the games and strategies influence each other, leading to a strong correlation between surviving games and strategies.

Beyond well-mixed scenarios, we find that structured populations enhance cooperation levels for small values of p_g . In particular, homogeneous graphs such as lattices and random regular networks lead to a majority cooperation state even with a low initial share of cooperators. This effect, however, weakens with increasing p_g . In the

specific case of 2D lattices, we also observed that clustering similar games promotes cooperation and leads to the coexistence of large clusters of cooperative games.

In the case of scale-free networks we have found that, in contrast to homogeneous graphs, the co-evolutionary dynamics leads to a promotion of cooperation that does not vary much with respect to the initial fraction of cooperation and, more importantly, increases with the value of p_g . Moreover, strategically placing a small number of cooperators on high-degree nodes reinforces pro-social behaviour.

In summary, our findings shed light on the complex mechanisms shaping evolutionary processes and the interplay between strategic decision-making and mutating environments that define choices. Our work contributes to exploring the origins of social dilemmas prevalent in social settings. For the future, considering additional features such as community structure [56], time-varying [57], and higher-order interactions [58] may offer further insights into co-evolutionary processes of strategies and games in real-world systems [59]. We hope that our work inspires more research on co-evolutionary dynamics as an avenue to tackle the puzzle of cooperation.

Acknowledgements

A.C. and V.L. acknowledge support from the European Union - NextGenerationEU, GRINS project (grant E63-C22-0021-20006). F.B. acknowledges support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA8655-22-1-7025. J.G.G. acknowledges financial support from the Departamento de Industria e Innovación del Gobierno de Aragón y Fondo Social Europeo (FENOL group grant E36-23R) and from Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (grant PID2020-113582GB-I00).

-
- [1] J. M. Smith and G. R. Price, *Nature* **246**, 15 (1973).
 - [2] R. Axelrod and W. D. Hamilton, *Science* **211**, 1390 (1981).
 - [3] J. Maynard Smith, *Evolution and the theory of games* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge ; New York, 1982).
 - [4] M. A. Nowak and R. M. May, *Nature* **359**, 826 (1992).
 - [5] M. Nowak and R. Highfield, *SuperCooperators: altruism, evolution, and why we need each other to succeed*, 1st ed. (Free Press, New York, NY, 2012).
 - [6] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
 - [7] P. D. Taylor and L. B. Jonker, *Mathematical Biosciences* **40**, 145 (1978).
 - [8] M. A. Nowak, *Science* **314**, 1560 (2006).
 - [9] G. Szabó and G. Fáth, *Physics Reports* **446**, 97 (2007).
 - [10] X.-Y. L. Richter and J. Lehtonen, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **378**, 20210492 (2023).
 - [11] F. C. Santos and J. M. Pacheco, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 098104 (2005).
 - [12] F. C. Santos, J. M. Pacheco, and T. Lenaerts, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **103**, 3490 (2006).
 - [13] J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Campillo, L. M. Floría, and Y. Moreno, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 108103 (2007).
 - [14] M. Perc, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, A. Szolnoki, L. M. Floría, and Y. Moreno, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **10**, 20120997 (2013).
 - [15] M. Perc, J. J. Jordan, D. G. Rand, Z. Wang, S. Boccaletti, and A. Szolnoki, *Physics Reports* **687**, 1 (2017).
 - [16] Z. Wang, A. Szolnoki, and M. Perc, *Physical Review E* **90**, 032813 (2014).
 - [17] N. E. Glynatsi and V. A. Knight, *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* **8**, 45 (2021).
 - [18] E. Solan and N. Vieille, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 13743 (2015).
 - [19] C. Hilbe, Š. Šimsa, K. Chatterjee, and M. Nowak, *Nature* **559**, 246 (2018).

- [20] Q. Su, A. McAvoy, L. Wang, and M. A. Nowak, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 25398 (2019).
- [21] P. Galeazzi and A. Galeazzi, *Synthese* **198**, 11241 (2021).
- [22] L. Shu and F. Fu, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **478**, 20220567 (2022).
- [23] S. Roy, S. Nag Chowdhury, P. C. Mali, M. Perc, and D. Ghosh, *PLOS ONE* **17**, e0272719 (2022).
- [24] K. Pattni, W. Ali, M. Broom, and K. J. Sharkey [10.48550/ARXIV.2304.01903](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.01903) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [25] J. Hofbauer and W. H. Sandholm, *Journal of Economic Theory* **132**, 47 (2007).
- [26] M. A. Amaral, L. Wardil, M. Perc, and J. K. L. da Silva, *Physical Review E* **93**, 042304 (2016).
- [27] V. R. Venkateswaran and C. S. Gokhale, *Evolutionary dynamics of multiple games*, preprint (Evolutionary Biology, 2018).
- [28] A. Szolnoki and M. Perc, *Scientific Reports* **9**, 12575 (2019).
- [29] A. R. Tilman, J. B. Plotkin, and E. Akçay, *Nature Communications* **11**, 915 (2020).
- [30] Z. Zeng, Q. Li, and M. Feng, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **32**, 073118 (2022).
- [31] Z. Han, P. Zhu, and J. Shi, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **166**, 112894 (2023).
- [32] L. Chen, C. Deng, M. H. Duong, and T. A. Han [10.48550/ARXIV.2303.16558](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.16558) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [33] M. Feng, B. Pi, L.-J. Deng, and J. Kurths, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* , 1 (2023).
- [34] M. Kleshnina, C. Hilbe, Š. Šimsa, K. Chatterjee, and M. A. Nowak, *Nature Communications* **14**, 4153 (2023).
- [35] B. Schönfisch and A. de Roos, *Biosystems* **51**, 123 (1999).
- [36] P. Schuster and K. Sigmund, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **100**, 533 (1983).
- [37] L. E. Blume, *Games and Economic Behavior* **5**, 387 (1993).
- [38] G. Szabó and C. Tóke, *Physical Review E* **58**, 69 (1998).
- [39] S. Méléard and D. Villemonais, *Probability Surveys* **9**, 340 (2012).
- [40] M. M. de Oliveira and R. Dickman, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 016129 (2005).
- [41] D. Zhou, B. Wu, and H. Ge, *J. Theor. Biol.* **264**, 874 (2010).
- [42] M. Faure and S. J. Schreiber, *J. Appl. Probab.* **24**, [10.1214/13-AAP923](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1214/13-AAP923) (2014).
- [43] R. S. Sander, G. S. Costa, and S. C. Ferreira, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 042308 (2016).
- [44] A. Civilini, N. Anbarci, and V. Latora, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 268301 (2021).
- [45] J. Cheng, W. Mei, W. Su, and G. Chen [10.48550/ARXIV.2304.14913](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.14913) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [46] N. Fijalkow, N. Bertrand, P. Bouyer-Decitre, R. Breguier, A. Carayol, J. Fearnley, H. Gimbert, F. Horn, R. Ibsen-Jensen, N. Markey, B. Monmege, P. Novotný, M. Randour, O. Sankur, S. Schmitz, O. Serre, and M. Skomra [10.48550/ARXIV.2305.10546](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.10546) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [47] D. L. Pires, I. V. Erovenko, and M. Broom, *PLOS ONE* **18**, e0289366 (2023).
- [48] A. Kumar, V. Capraro, and M. Perc, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **17**, 20200491 (2020).
- [49] L. S. Flores, M. A. Amaral, M. H. Vainstein, and H. C. Fernandes, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **164**, 112744 (2022).
- [50] G. Ichinose, D. Miyagawa, E. Chiba, and H. Sayama, *Artificial Life* , 1 (2022).
- [51] A. Locodi and C. O’Riordan, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **168**, 113144 (2023).
- [52] M. McPherson, L. Smith-Lovin, and J. M. Cook, *Annual Review of Sociology* **27**, 415 (2001).
- [53] F. Karimi, M. Géniois, C. Wagner, P. Singer, and M. Strohmaier, *Scientific Reports* **8**, 11077 (2018).
- [54] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
- [55] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D. Hwang, *Physics Reports* **424**, 175 (2006).
- [56] B. Fotouhi, N. Momeni, B. Allen, and M. A. Nowak, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **16**, 20180677 (2019).
- [57] J. Bhaumik and N. Masuda [10.48550/ARXIV.2304.00170](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.00170) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [58] A. Civilini, O. Sadekar, F. Battiston, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, and V. Latora [10.48550/ARXIV.2303.11475](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.11475) (2023), publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- [59] A. Traulsen and N. E. Glynatsi, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **378**, 20210508 (2023).