

A model of sympatric speciation through assortative mating

Franco Bagnoli^{1,2,3} and Carlo Guardiani^{3,y}

¹ Dipartimento di Energetica, Università di Firenze, Via S. Marta 3, I-50139 Firenze, Italy

² INFN and INFN

³ Centro Interdipartimentale per lo Studio delle Dinamiche Complesse, Università di Firenze, Via Sansone 1, I-50019, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy

February 9, 2020

Abstract

A microscopic model is developed, within the frame of the theory of quantitative traits, to study both numerically and analytically the combined effect of competition and assortativity on the sympatric speciation process, i.e. speciation in the absence of geographical barriers. Two components of fitness are considered: a static one that describes adaptation to environmental factors not related to the population itself, and a dynamic one that accounts for interactions between organisms, e.g. competition. The effects of finiteness of population size on survival of coexisting species are also accounted for. The simulations show that both in the case of flat and ripid static fitness landscapes, competition and assortativity do exert a synergistic effect on speciation. We also show that competition acts as a stabilizing force against extinction due to random sampling in a finite population. Finally, evidence is shown that speciation can be seen as a phase transition.

^Electronic address: bagnoli@dm.unifi.it

^yElectronic address: carlo@dm.unifi.it

1 The problem

The concept of speciation i.e. the splitting of an original species into two fertile, yet reproductively isolated strains is one of the basic ideas of Darwinian theory of evolution and has been deeply investigated by biologists. Nevertheless the matter is still very controversial and far from being fully understood.

The allopatric theory, which is currently accepted by the majority of biologists, claims that a geographic barrier is needed in order to break the gene flow so as to allow two strains to evolve a complete reproductive isolation.

On the other hand, many evidences and experimental data have been reported in recent years strongly suggesting the possibility of a sympatric mechanism of speciation. For example, the comparison of mitochondrial DNA sequences of cytochrome b performed by Schlieven and others [1], showed the monophyletic origin of cichlid species living in some volcanic lakes of western Africa. The main features of these lakes are the environmental homogeneity and the absence of microgeographical barriers. It is thus possible that the present diversity is the result of several events of sympatric speciation. Increasing evidence for the sympatric origin of many species groups is accumulating rapidly in recent years. An interesting example is represented by the sticklebacks in lakes of British Columbia featuring large benthic species and small limnetic ones. Evidence on the sympatric origin of these groups has been collected both through experimental research (Schluter 1994, Nagel and Schluter 1998, Rundle and Schluter 1998) [2, 3, 4] and through phylogenetic studies (Taylor and McPhail 1999) [5]. Further evidence for sympatric speciation comes from studies on organisms such as intertidal snails (Johannesson et al. 1995) [6], Anolis lizards (Losos et al. 1998) [7] and Senecio trees (Knox and Palmer 1995) [8]. However, evidence for sympatric speciation from field experiments on organisms with long generation times will almost always be circumstantial to some extent. A more direct approach to collect data on the speciation mechanism is represented by studies of experimental evolution of microorganisms. Recent work by Rainey and Travisano (1998) [9], for example, shows that sympatric divergence can be induced in bacteria by placing them in a novel environment.

However, Bagnoli and Bezzi [10] showed that for non-recombinant populations a sympatric divergence can be induced by competition. In this model, however, it is not possible to talk about speciation strictu sensu because a species in biology is defined as a group of organisms which are interfertile

and reproductively isolated from other such groups. This definition of species does not apply to asexual organisms and the concept of "species" in microbiology is now based on phylogenetic relatedness that can be determined from similarities of DNA and RNA sequences. For asexual microorganisms it would be therefore more correct to use Eigen's notion of quasi-species as a cloud of points in the genotypic space [11].

A real speciation event, therefore, implies reproductive segregation, but in order to formulate a plausible model of sympatric speciation one has to explain how a population can split into two groups which are interfertile at least in the first stages.

Let us first examine the case of a single population. The main hindrance to this splitting is random mating. If two distinct ecological types arise in a population so that the frequency distribution becomes bimodal and organisms of the first hump are free to choose their partner in the second hump, the offspring will have intermediate phenotype and the distribution will never split into distinct peaks.

It is thus clear that sympatric speciation requires a certain degree of assortative mating, that is, mating must be allowed only between individuals whose phenotypic distance does not exceed a given threshold. The assortativeness itself can be a selective character.

In many models of sympatric speciation, attention is focused on two characters, an ecological one determining adaptation to the environment and a mating preference character. Both characters are modeled as quantitative traits, i.e. they are determined by a large number of genes whose effects on the phenotype are small and additive. At first glance, sympatric speciation looks straightforward. If a lake contains two potential resources - say, large or small prey - then large or small predatory fishes will do well while medium-sized fishes will be at disadvantage. This disadvantage to intermediates is termed disruptive selection, creates pressure for divergence and it may induce the splitting of a population into two distinct ecological types [12, 13]. Actually, a bimodal resource distribution is not necessary for sympatric speciation. Dieckmann and Doebeli [14], for instance, showed that the effects of intraspecific competition are able to induce disruptive selection even for a gaussian resource distribution. In their simulation, the population at first crowds on the phenotype with the highest fitness, and then, owing to the high level of competition, splits into two distinct groups that later become reproductively isolated due to selection of assortative mating. This model was recently generalized within the frame of the theory of evolutionary branching [15]: the

population first converges in phenotype space to an evolutionarily attracting fitness minimum, and then it splits into two diverging phenotypic clusters. Selection regimes leading to evolutionary branching arise from a wide variety of common ecological interactions within and between species such as symmetric and asymmetric competition, mutualism and predator-prey interactions. The research was completed by showing that evolution under branching conditions selects for assortativeness.

In the present paper we do not tackle the problem of evolution of assortativity but we regard assortativity as a tunable but fixed parameter in order to shed light on possible synergetic effects with competition. We shall limit our analysis to haploid recombinant individuals, assuming that the main ingredient for the evolution of sexual organisms is recombination and not diploidy.

We show that the introduction of assortative mating is sufficient to induce a splitting of the populations when no phenotypes are privileged (a flat fitness landscape). Due to random sampling, two subpopulations may become reproductively isolated and diverge genotypically. However, this splitting is only a transient effect: in the long time run only a group survives [16]. This pattern is also observable in the case of steep fitness landscape: the peaks of the two new species now are asymmetrical, and the smaller peak relative to the species with lower fitness quickly disappears. We show that both in the case of flat and steep static fitness landscapes, competition acts as a stabilizing force, enabling the stable coexistence of the new species. Competition, on the other hand, also acts as a spreading inducer, as shown by the fact that lower assortativity levels are sufficient for speciation in the presence of high competition. This pattern strongly argues in favour of a synergistic effect of competition and assortativity on sympatric speciation.

In Section 2 we describe our model and briefly outline its implementation, providing some computational details; in Section 3 we report the results of the simulations distinguishing between the case of flat (subsection 3:1) and steep (subsection 3:2) static fitness landscapes; in Section 4 we show that speciation can be regarded as a phase transition; finally, in Section 5 we draw the conclusions of our study.

2 The model

Our model has been developed within the conceptual framework of the theory of quantitative traits [17, 18] whose basic principles are :

1. The variability of quantitative traits is due to the combined effects of many genes.
2. The effect of these genes are small, similar and additive.
3. The effect of environmental factors is superimposed to that of genes.

We consider a population of haploid individuals whose genome is represented by a string $(g_1; g_2; \dots; g_L)$ of L bits. Each bit represents a locus and the Boolean values it can take are regarded as alternative allelic forms. In particular $g_i = 0$ refers to the wild-type allele while $g_i = 1$ to the least deleterious mutant. The phenotype x , in agreement with the theory of quantitative traits, is just the sum of these bits, $x = \sum_{i=1}^L g_i$. The number of individuals carrying phenotype x at time t is denoted by $n(x;t)$, the total population size by $N(t) = \sum_{x=0}^L n(x;t)$ and the distribution of phenotypes by $p(x;t) = n(x;t)/N$. The initial population is always chosen as a random genetic distribution.

A time step is composed by three subprocess: selection, reproduction and mutations. The order of application of them depends on which biological phenomenon one is trying to approximate. For instance, mutations apply to all population if they accumulate during life, and only to the reproductive phase if they are supposed to set in during DNA reproduction. Selection acts prior to reproduction if it is supposed to model surviving capabilities, but after if one is interested in reproductive efficiency. We have checked that our results are insensitive on this minor details, which can become important in other situations.

Mutations are simply implemented by flipping a randomly chosen element of the genome from 0 to 1 or vice versa. This kind of mutations can only turn a phenotype x into one of its neighbours $x + 1$ or $x - 1$ and they are therefore referred to as short range mutations. The fact that both mutations $0 \rightarrow 1$ and $1 \rightarrow 0$ occur with the same probability is a coarse-grained approximation, because mutations affecting a wild-type allele (0 allele) usually impair its function, but mutations on already damaged genes (1 allele) are not very likely to restore their activity. One should therefore expect that

the frequency of the $1 - \mu$ mutations be significantly lower than that of the μ mutations. The choice of equal frequencies for both kinds of mutations, on the other hand, can be justified by assuming that mutations are mostly due to duplications of genes or to transposable elements that go in and out from target sites in DNA with equal frequencies. Another limitation of our model of mutations is that the frequency of mutation is independent of the locus. The frequency of mutation of a long gene, for example, should be higher than that of a short gene, and the frequency of mutation should be also dependent on the packing of chromatin. The inaccuracies in our model of mutation, however, do not impair the performance of the algorithm, because, as Bagnoli and Bezzi showed [10], the occupation of fitness maxima mainly depends on selection, while mutations only create genetic variability. Moreover, the role of mutations in the present model is even smaller, as genes are continuously rearranged through recombination.

The assortativity is introduced through a parameter α which represents the maximal phenotypic distance still compatible with reproduction. The reproduction phase is thus performed in this way. We choose one parent at random in the population, while the other parent is chosen among those whose phenotypic distance from the first parent is less than α . The genome of the offspring is built by choosing for each locus the allele of the first or second parent with the same probability and then mutations are introduced by inverting the value of one bit with probability μ . In our model we therefore assume absence of linkage, which is a simplification often used in literature. It must be remembered, however, that this simplification is only reasonable in the case of very long genomes subdivided into many independent chromosomes. To be consistent with the intuitive idea that assortativity reflects a bias of a phenotype to mate with similar strains, we define the assortativity as:

$$A = L$$

With regard to the selection phase, the choice of the fitness landscape is of paramount importance. In our model we consider a static and a dynamic component of fitness. The static component describes the adaptation to environmental factors not related to the population itself, e.g. abiotic factors such as climate, temperature, etc. The dynamic component describes how the interactions with other members of the population (competition, predation, mutualism) affect the fitness. This component changes in time as a function

of the population itself. In our very simplified model we considered only competition.

The static component of the fitness is defined as :

$$H_0(x) = e^{-\frac{x}{\sigma}}$$

We choose this function because it can reproduce several landscapes found in the literature by tuning the parameters σ and β . In particular $H_0(x)$ becomes flatter and flatter as the parameter σ is increased. When $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the sharp peak landscape at $x = 0$ [19, 20]; when $\sigma = 1$ the function is a declining exponential whose steepness depends on the parameter β ; and finally when $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ the fitness landscape is constant in the range $[0; \beta]$ and zero outside (step landscape). Some examples of the effects of σ on the static fitness profile are shown in figure 1.




Figure 1: Steep profiles of static fitness $H_0(x)$. From top to bottom $\sigma = 1; 2; 3$ and $\sigma = 1$

The dynamic part of the fitness has a similar expression, with parameters σ and R that control the steepness and range of competition among phenotypes.

The complete expression of the fitness landscape is:

$$H(x;t) = H_0(x) \prod_y e^{-\frac{1}{J} \frac{x-y}{R}} p(y;t) \quad (1)$$

The parameter J controls the intensity of competition with respect to the arbitrary reference value $H_0(0) = 1$. If $J = 0$ an individual with phenotype x is in competition only with other organisms with the same phenotype; conversely in the case $J \rightarrow \infty$ a phenotype x is in competition with all the other phenotypes in the range $[x - R; x + R]$, and the boundaries of this competition intervals blurry when J is decreased.

The way we choose to introduce the fitness landscape $H(x)$ into our model is through the survival probability $A(x;t) = e^{-H(x;t)}$. Bagnoli and Bezzi [21] show that every fitness function that depends on the population only through the probability distribution implies a decoupling between the evolution of the distribution and that of the total population size. Moreover they show [21] that this hypothesis is consistent with the mean field approach. We have thus chosen to simulate non-overlapping generations and fixed-size population.

As an illustration, the evolution equation for the distribution $p(x;t)$ in the limit of infinite population, non-sexual reproduction and absence of mutations is:

$$p(x;t+1) = \frac{A(x;t)}{A(t)} p(x;t)$$

where $A(t) = \int_x A(x;t) p(x;t)$. The idea beyond this approach is quite simple: individuals with a fitness higher than average have got the best chances to survive.

We now briefly review the implementation of our model. The initial population is chosen at random and stored in a bidimensional matrix with $L+1$ rows and N columns. Each row represents one of the possible phenotypes; as the whole population might crowd on a single phenotype, N memory locations must be allocated for each phenotype. Each generation begins with the reproduction step. The first parent is chosen at random with probability equal to the frequency of its fitness class; in a similar way, the second parent is randomly chosen within the mating range of the first one, i.e. within the range $[max\{0; i - g; min\{L; i + g\}]$. More formally, our mating preference function is:

$$m(y; z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |y - z| > \epsilon \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

The offspring is produced through uniform recombination, i.e., for each locus it will receive the allele of the first or second parent with equal probability; the recombinant then undergoes mutation on a random allele with probability μ . The newborn individuals are stored in a second matrix with $L + 1$ rows and L columns. The reproduction procedure is followed by the selection step. As we consider a constant size population, a cycle is iterated until N individuals are copied back from the second to the first matrix. In each iteration of the cycle, an individual is chosen at random and its relative fitness is compared to a random number r with uniform distribution between 0 and 1: if $r < A(x)/A$ the individual survives and is passed on to the next generation, otherwise a new attempt is made.

It should be noted that both reproduction and selection steps are affected by stochastic components, i.e. the reproduction and survival possibility of an individual does not depend only on its fitness but also on accidental and unpredictable circumstances, which is quite realistic. Consider for instance, an individual colonizing a new territory: its fitness will be very high due to the availability of resources and lack of competition, but, as the region is still scarcely populated, it may be difficult to find a partner and it may not reproduce at all. Similar remarks apply to an individual with high fitness that is accidentally killed by a landslide or by the flood of a river.

3 Results

3.1 Flat static fitness landscape

One of the simplest situations we can conceive, is a flat static fitness profile in presence or absence of competition.

In this conditions, in a regime of random mating, a population is unable to speciate and the only result we obtain, even employing extremely high competition levels is a trimodal frequency distribution. The situation is shown in Figure 2. Two humps appear at the opposite ends of the phenotypic space so as to minimize the mutual competition while the central hump is fed by the offspring of crossings between the other two humps. If we follow the time course of the simulation, we notice that the valley between the first two and

the last two humps of the trimodal distribution in some generations deepens, but in the very next time step it rises again. This behaviour is easily predictable because the random mating regime allows crossing between phenotypes of the two humps filling each valley regenerating the intermediate phenotypes.




Figure 2: A polymodal frequency distribution (solid line) generated in a random mating regime with an extremely high competition intensity. Parameters: $J = 16, R = 7, L = 14$. Generation : 1040.

The scenario becomes completely different if we impose a regime of assortative mating. In this case, even in the absence of competition, very interesting dynamical behaviours ensue.

As an illustration, let us consider the case $L = 14$. If we set a moderate value of assortativity $\alpha = 4$, the frequency distribution progressively narrows until it becomes a sharp peak at the level of one of the intermediate phenotypes. This behaviour can be easily explained. The simulation begins with a very wide and flat bell-shaped frequency distribution; if we now consider, for instance, a phenotype x in the right tail of the distribution, it will preferentially mate with partners in the range $[x - \alpha; x]$ (the phenotypes in the range $[x; x + \alpha]$ may be larger than L and are therefore not existing, and in any case they have extremely low frequencies and are thus very unlikely to be chosen as mating partners). This implies that the offspring of x will also

lie between x and x and this leads to a contraction of the distribution tails. Some significant snapshots of the simulation are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Effects of moderate assortativity in the absence of competition. Parameters: $J = 0, R = 2, \beta = 4$. From top left to bottom right, snapshots after 1, 300, 600 and 900 generations.

If we impose a higher level of assortativity $\alpha = 2$, the distribution becomes flat and wide and it eventually splits into two distinct peaks: a speciation event has taken place. This happens because when the mating range is sufficiently small, the mating frequencies of a phenotype x in the right tail of the distribution with other x individuals or with partners in the range $[x - \delta; x)$ are very similar and the offspring will be similar to the x parent too. Conversely, phenotypes in the center of the distribution, having almost the same number of 1 and 0 alleles, will generate offspring very different from the parents even when they are forced to mate only with neighbouring phenotypes, and this, of course, lowers the central part of the distribution.

The simulations show (Figures 4 and 5) that eventually, one of the two quasi-species generated in the speciation event becomes extinct. This is due to the fact that we consider finite size populations and in our model three stochastic components are present, namely the random choice of the initial population and the random choice of candidates for reproduction and selection.




Figure 4: Effects of high assortativity in the absence of competition. Parameters: $J = 0, R = 2, \beta = 2$. From top left to bottom right snapshots at generations 1, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250. ₁₃




Figure 5: Prosecution of picture 4. Parameters: $J = 0, R = 2, \alpha = 2$. Left : generation 300; right: generation 500.

On the other hand, competition may stabilize multispecies coexistence. With this respect, it must be remembered that competition is inversely correlated with the phenotypic distance and therefore the competition between individuals with the same phenotype is maximal. Besides, competition is also proportional to the population density. As a result, if the number of individuals of a species increases (owing to random sampling, for instance), the intraspecific competition increases as well, leading to a decrease in fitness which, in turn, determines a reduction of the population size at the following generation.

In conclusion, competition acts as a stabilizing force preventing the population from extinction. The simulations show that a moderate level of competition ($J = 3$) is sufficient to save both species from extinction even in the case of high assortativity ($\alpha = 2$).

Another important phenomenon investigated in our work is the synergistic effect of competition and assortativity on speciation. We have already noticed that, while a high level of assortativity ($\alpha = 2$) determines speciation even in the absence of competition ($J = 0$), a moderate assortativity ($\alpha = 4$) is insufficient leading to the formation of a single sharp peak at the center of the phenotypic space.

However, if competition is introduced ($J = 3, R = 4$), speciation does

occur. The simulations also show an inverse correlation between competition and assortativity at the threshold for species coexistence. For example, if we set the mating range $r = 5$, the competition intensity J will have to be increased up to 4 if speciation is still to occur.

3.2 Steep static fitness landscape

In our model we assume that the 0-allele represents the wild-type while the 1-allele is the least deleterious mutant. This entails that the larger the number of 1-alleles in a genotype, the lower the fitness. This is why a particularly interesting case to investigate is that of a monotonic decreasing static fitness.

In the absence of competition the asymptotic distribution is a sharp peak on the master sequence $x = 0$. In this case, the whole population crowds on the phenotype with the highest fitness level. The simulations show that the steeper the static fitness and the higher the mating assortativity, the more rapidly the sharp peak distribution is reached.

The role of assortativity (which is more clearly illustrated when the fitness is not too rapid, $r > 80$), is not trivial. We have already seen that when the static fitness landscape is flat, a high level of assortativity rapidly induces speciation even in the absence of competition; when the fitness profile is rapid one of the species (the most distant from the master sequence) comes to a disadvantage and goes extinct (see figure 6).




Figure 6: Appearance of a single sharp peak on the master sequence in absence of competition and high assortativity. Parameters: $J = 0, R = 6, \mu = 150, \nu = 0$. From top left to bottom right snapshots at generations 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100.

Once again, competition plays a key role as a powerful stabilizing force. When mating is random, the only effect of an extremely high competition is to induce the formation of a wide and flat frequency distribution spanning over all the phenotypic space, but no distinct species will appear.

In conditions of high assortativity $\alpha = 3$, a moderate level of competition ($J = 2$) is sufficient to induce the appearance of two asymmetric sharp peaks. The tallest peak appears on the master sequence because this is the position of the phenotypic space with the highest static fitness; the other peak, at the opposite end of the phenotypic space, is smaller because it is near the static fitness minimum but it won't go extinct because, being very far from the first peak, it enjoys the lowest possible interspecific competition.

If competition is increased up to $J = 7$, the population splits in two species with more or less the same frequency but with distributions showing very different geometries. While the master sequence species still exhibits a sharp peak distribution, the species near $x = L$ shows a wide and flat bell-shaped frequency distribution so as to minimize the intraspecific competition. A comparison of the asymptotic distributions with $J = 2$ and $J = 7$ is shown in figure 7.




Figure 7: Effect of competition intensity on the frequency distribution geometry. Left: $J = 2, R = 4, \alpha = 10, \beta = 3$, generation 1000. Right: $J = 7, R = 4, \alpha = 10, \beta = 3$, generation 1000.

On the other hand, assortative mating, affecting species distribution, has also an influence on fitness. If we set $\alpha = 0$ i.e. we allow matings only between individuals with the same phenotype, three sharp peaks will appear whose symmetry depends on the static fitness steepness (see figure 8). The third peak lies halfway between the peaks at $x = 0$ and $x = L$ and enjoys an intermediate level of static fitness that is sufficient to counteract competition from the neighbouring species.




Figure 8: Effect of maximal assortativity : appearance of a peak in the middle of the phenotypic space. Left: $J = 4, R = 4, \alpha = 2, \beta = 0$, generation 1000. Right: $J = 4, R = 4, \alpha = 50, \beta = 0$, generation 1000.

In this example, in which $R = 4$, the central peak suffers from competition of both extreme strains and therefore survival is extremely dependent on dispersion of its offspring. Dispersion becomes minimal when the population becomes genotypically homogeneous. As shown by simulations, the maximal assortativity (that acts on phenotype) induces the necessary homogeneity.

4 Phase diagrams

One of the purposes of the present work was to study the evolutionary dynamics in the widest possible range of competition and assortativity so as

to bring to light a possible synergetic effect on speciation. As this kind of research requires a huge number of simulations, the problem arises to find an easily computable mathematical parameter suitable for monitoring the speciation process.

With this respect, one of the best candidates is surely the variance that, as is common knowledge, represents a measure of the dispersion of a distribution:

$$\text{var}(x) = \sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2 p(x_i)$$

The simulations, in fact, show that, as competition and/or assortativity is increased, the frequency distribution first widens, then it becomes bimodal and eventually it splits in two sharp peaks that move in the phenotypic space so as to maximize their reciprocal distance: each of these steps involves an increase in the variance of the frequency distribution.

As we will discuss in more detail, when variance is plotted as a function of both competition and assortativity, the surface shows a sharp transition from a very low value to a plateau at a very high variance level when assortativity and competition become larger than a certain threshold. A analysis of the distribution shows that the sharp transition from the low to the high variance level is indicative of the shift from a state with a single quasi-species to a state with two distinct quasi-species. The variance plot can be therefore considered as a speciation phase diagram.

Let's start by examining the variance plot as a function of competition and assortativity in the relatively simple case of a flat static fitness.

A graphical approach to highlight the synergistic effect is to study the contour plots of the tridimensional speciation phase diagram (Figure 9).

The contour plots divide the J, A plane in two regions: the area on the left represents the state with a single quasi-species whereas the area on the right represents the state with two or more distinct quasi-species. If a point, owing to a change in competition and/or assortativity, crosses these borderlines moving from the first to the second region, a speciation event does occur. It should be noted that in the case of flat static fitness, and, to a smaller extent, also in the case of steep static fitness, in the high competition region the contour plots tend to diverge from each other showing a gradual increase of the variance of the frequency distributions. This is due to the fact that, even if competition alone is not sufficient to induce speciation in recombinant populations, it spreads the frequency distribution




Figure 9: Some significant contour plots of the phase diagram in the case of flat static fitness landscape. Contour levels equally spaced from $\text{var} = 5$ to $\text{var} = 35$ with increments of 5 units.

that becomes wider and wider, and splits into two distinct species only for extremely high assortativity values. In this regime of high competition only the ends of the mating range of a phenotype x are populated and the crossings between these comparatively different individuals will create once again the intermediate phenotypes preventing speciation until assortativity becomes almost maximal.

The speciation phase diagram has been studied also in the case of a steep static fitness landscape. As in the previous case, we analyze some significant contour plots (Figure 10). The down sloping shape of these lines, again, is a strong indication of a synergistic interaction of competition and assortativity on the speciation process. The contour plots show that for moderate competition there is a synergistic effect between competition and assortativity since a simultaneous increase of J and A may allow the crossing of the borderline whereas the increase of a parameter at a time does not. On the other hand, for larger values of J the phase diagram shows a reentrant

character due to the extinction of one of the species that cannot move farther apart from the other and therefore cannot relieve competition anymore. It can also be noticed that for $J = 0$ the contour plot shows a change in slope due to extinction of one species owing to random fluctuations as shown earlier.

The following differences with respect to the case of flat static fitness can be detected: the curvature of the borderlines between the coexistence phases is higher, which indicates a stronger synergy between A and J ; the absence of speciation for moderate J here is not due to finite size effects.




Figure 10: Some significant contour plots of the phase diagram in the case of a steep static fitness landscape. Contour levels equally spaced from $\text{var} = 5$ to $\text{var} = 35$ with increments of 5 units.

5 Conclusions

A microscopic model has been developed for the study of sympatric speciation i.e. the origin of two reproductively isolated strains from a single original

species in the absence of any geographical barrier.

We showed that in a flat static fitness landscape, assortativity alone is sufficient to induce speciation even in the absence of competition. This speciation event, however, is only transient, and soon one of the two new species goes extinct due to random fluctuations in a finite-size population. A stable coexistence between the new species, however, could be achieved by introducing competition. In fact, intraspecific competition turned out to stabilize the two groups by operating a sort of negative feedback on population size.

The simulations also showed that the assortativity level necessary for speciation could be reduced as competition is increased and vice versa (except for the regime of extremely high competition), which strongly argues for a synergistic effect between the two parameters.

Similar patterns could be observed with a steep static fitness landscape. A high assortativity level is sufficient to induce speciation, but in the long run only the peak with maximal fitness survives. The coexistence of the two species again is stabilized by competition.

A special attention was devoted to finite size effects. We showed that in posing maximal assortativity, in the presence of moderate competition, it was possible to reduce dispersion of offspring and thus stabilize genotypically homogeneous peaks. In particular, in our 15-phenotypes fitness space, it was possible to stabilize the coexistence of three species, whose peaks tended to become symmetrical as the steepness of the fitness landscape was reduced.

Finally, we showed that speciation has the character of a phase transition, as the variance versus assortativity and competition surface shows a sharp transition from a low variance region corresponding to one species, to a high-variance region corresponding to two species. The curvature of the phase boundary once again supports the idea of a synergistic effect of competition and assortativity in inducing speciation.

References

- [1] U.K. Schlieven, D. Tautz, and S. Paabo. Sympatric speciation suggested by monophyly of crater lake cichlids. *Nature*, 368:629-632, 1994.
- [2] D. Schluter. Experimental evidence that competition promotes divergence in adaptive radiation. *Science*, 266:798-801, 1994.

- [3] L. Nagel and D. Schluter. Body size, natural selection, and speciation in sticklebacks. *Evolution*, 52:209{218, 1998.
- [4] H. D. Rundle and D. Schluter. Reinforcement of stickleback mate preferences: Sympatry breeds contempt. *Evolution*, 52:200{208, 1998.
- [5] E. B. Taylor and J. D. M. C. Phail. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 66:271{291, 1999.
- [6] K. Johannesson, E. Rolan-Alvarez, and A. Eklund. Incipient reproductive isolation between two sympatric morphs of the intertidal snail *Littorina saxatilis*. *Evolution*, 49:1180{1190, 1995.
- [7] J. B. Losos, T. R. Jackman, A. Larson, K. de Queiroz, and L. Rodriguez-Schettino. Contingency and determinism in replicated adaptive radiations of island lizards. *Science*, 279:2115{2118, 1998.
- [8] E. B. Knox and J. D. Palmer. Chloroplast dna variation and the recent radiation of the giant senecios (asteraceae) on the tall mountains of eastern africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 92:10349{10353, 1995.
- [9] P. B. Rainey and M. Travisano. Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment. *Nature*, 394:69{72, 1999.
- [10] F. Bagnoli and M. Bezzi. *Physical Review Letters*, 79:3302, 1997.
- [11] G. Rowe. *Theoretical models in biology*. Clarendon Press, 1994.
- [12] T. Tregenza and R. K. Butlin. Speciation without isolation. *Nature*, 400:311{312, 1999.
- [13] A. S. Kondrashov and F. A. Kondrashov. Interactions among quantitative traits in the course of sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400:351{354, 1999.
- [14] U. Dieckmann and M. Doebeli. On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400:354{357, 1999.
- [15] U. Dieckmann and M. Doebeli. Evolutionary branching and sympatric speciation caused by different types of ecological interactions. IIA SA Interim Report IR-00-040, July 2000.

- [16] P.G. Higgins and B. Moolenaar. Genetic distance and species formation in evolving population. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 35:454-465, 1992.
- [17] D.S. Falconer and T.F.C. Mackay. *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1996, 4th Edition.
- [18] M. Lynch and B. Walsh. *Genetics and Analysis of Quantitative Traits*. Sinauer Associates Inc., 1998.
- [19] L. Peliti. Fitness landscapes and evolution. In T. Riste and D. Sherrington, editors, *Physics of Biomaterials: Fluctuations, Self-Assembly and Evolution*, pages 287-308. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1996.
- [20] L. Peliti. Introduction to the statistical theory of darwinian evolution. Lectures given at ICTP Summer College on frustrated systems, Trieste. Notes taken by Ugo Bastolla and Susanna Manrubia, August 1997.
- [21] F. Bagnoli and M. Bezzi. An evolutionary model for simple ecosystems. In Dietrich Stauffer, editor, *Annual Reviews of Computational Physics* VII, pages 265-309. World Scientific Publishing Company, 1999.