

Periodical cicadas: a minimal automaton model

Giovano de O. Cardozo^a Daniel de A. M. M. Silvestre^{a,*}
Alexandre Colato^b

^a*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 369,
13560-970 São Carlos SP, Brazil*

^b*Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana, Departamento de Física. Campus
Universitário, BR 116, KM 03, 44031-460, Feira de Santana BA, Brazil*

Abstract

The *Magicicada spp.* life cycles with its prime periods and highly synchronized emergence have defied reasonable scientific explanation since its discovery. During the last decade several models and explanations for this phenomenon appeared in the literature along with a great deal of discussion. Despite this considerable effort, there is no final conclusion about this long standing biological problem. Here, we construct a minimal automaton model without predation/parasitism which reproduces some of these aspects. Our results point towards competition between different strains with limited dispersal threshold as the main factor leading to the emergence of prime numbered life cycles.

Key words: *Magicicada*, celular automaton, patch dynamics, competition

PACS: 87.10.+e, 87.23.n, 07.05.Tp

1 Introduction

2 The origin and evolution of the *Magicicada spp.* life cycles is one of the most
3 intriguing problems in population biology and evolution. These long term pe-
4 riodical life cycles with prime period (namely 13 and 17 years) and the incred-
5 ibly synchronized emergence of the adults have defied all attempts of ultimate
6 explanation since their discovery some 300 years ago [1]. During the last 15
7 years a plethora of models and possible explanations for this phenomenon

* Corresponding author: silvestre@ifsc.usp.br

8 appeared in the literature (e.g. [1,2,3,4,5,6] and [7,8] for a good review). How-
9 ever, despite this considerable effort, there is no final conclusion about this
10 long standing biological problem. Currently, there seems to be two main lines
11 debating this subject. The traditional line advocates that this type of life
12 cycle emerges as response of the cicadas against predation pressure and lim-
13 ited resources [3,6,9,10,11,12]. Thus, a prime numbered life cycle with highly
14 synchronized emergence is thought to be a strategy to evade predation by
15 minimizing the probability of interspecific interaction and promote predator
16 satiation during population exposure at the adult part of its life cycle. On
17 the other hand, some authors propose that this type of life history emerges to
18 avoid hybridization between the different strains of cicadas under harsh envi-
19 ronmental conditions[13,14,15]. Specifically, environmental conditions had led
20 to delayed emergence and limited mating opportunities during ice age periods
21 and this promoted synchronization in populations with periodic life cycles.
22 In this scenario, the prevalence of prime numbered life cycles is explained by
23 their low probability of hybridization with other life cycles. It's important to
24 state that, by definition, an insect is said to be periodic if its life cycle has a
25 fixed length of k years ($k > 1$) and adults do not appear every year but only
26 every k th year. Otherwise, we call that insect annual, despite of the length of
27 its life cycle (cf. [12]).

28 Recently, three accounts on the subject were published [1,6,16] suggesting a
29 somewhat different line of thought. Those authors believe that competition is
30 the main factor leading to periodicity as defined above, based on the assump-
31 tion that competition between different strains is stronger than competition
32 within a specific strain [12]. They suggest competition between strains with
33 nymphs of other cicada species (outside the *Magicicada* group) would enhance
34 selection for periodicity by augmenting the intensity of intraspecific compe-
35 tition and determining the spatial distribution of the strains. The emergence
36 of prime periods would either be just an artifact of the process [1] or even
37 does not need an explanation at all [16]. In [6], the model used deal with most
38 aspects reviewed here in a very simple and clear manner. One can verify that
39 the assumptions made by those authors are, indeed, biologically reasonable.
40 Nevertheless, the problem still persists. What are the sufficient conditions for
41 the emergence of prime numbered life cycles? Which mechanisms are respon-
42 sible for that? To what extent? In this contribution, we will try to address
43 some of these questions in a straightforward manner.

44 2 The Model

45 Our model is inspired on the works of Campos *et al.* and Goles *et al.* [2,6] with
46 some simplifications and a rather different biological interpretation. Instead
47 of a individual-based population dynamics, our model consists of very simple

48 patch dynamics in the spirit found in [17]. Based on [16], we assume compe-
 49 tition as the principal ingredient in this scenario. In this way, the dynamics
 50 presented here do not include any type of antagonistic interaction besides the
 51 competition between the strains. Therefore, we construct a stochastic cellular
 52 automaton with periodic boundaries on a squared lattice of linear dimension
 53 L . Each lattice site represents one habitat patch. At a given generation, a
 54 patch may be empty ($s_i(t) = 0$) or colonized ($s_i(t) = 1$) by a subpopulation.
 55 If this is the case, the colonized patch has two more characteristics: a life
 56 cycle $k = 2 \dots, d$ defined by its length in generations and an age $t_i(t)$. The
 57 parameter d stands for the total diversity of life cycles. The update of each
 58 patch runs in parallel and each generation (our discrete time step) consists
 59 of a complete lattice update. At each generation step, all occupied sites have
 60 its age incremented by 1. When colonized patch has age equal to its life cy-
 61 cle length ($t_i(t) = k$) we say that it is in the active state. Biologically, this
 62 corresponds to the adult part of the cicada life cycle. Individuals can only in-
 63 teract directly during this phase of its life cycle. On the other hand, every time
 64 an empty patch (inactive site) is found we look at its closest neighborhood
 65 (Moore neighborhood with range 1) and count the number of active patches.
 66 If the number of these is greater than the dispersal threshold parameter M ,
 67 that empty patch will be eventually colonized. After this, a randomly chosen
 68 active patch is picked from the neighborhood and that individual will be re-
 69 sponsible for the colonization of the empty patch. The newly colonized patch
 70 has the same life cycle length of its colonizer and age set to zero. This pro-
 71 cess is biologically reasonable and mimics very well a competitive dynamics
 72 between the different strains of cicadas. The parameter M can be viewed as
 73 measure of a tendency for dispersal of the population. Therefore, for small M
 74 there is a high tendency for dispersal and we need small populational density
 75 to have that. Conversely, a large M implies in a high populational density in
 76 order to promote dispersal. At the end of a generation step, all active patches
 77 have their age set to zero and the whole process begin again.

78 For each simulation run, a fraction x_0 of the lattice is initially occupied, ran-
 79 domly. For each of occupied patch, a life cycle and an age are selected, in this
 80 order, from a discrete uniform distribution according to the limits imposed by
 81 the parameter d . Therefore, the initial population is a random mixture of all
 82 possible life cycles in a complete desynchronized fashion. Our main interest is
 83 to study the long term behavior of this kind of system and to verify whether
 84 we can recover the results found in [2,6] in this simplified scenario. Henceforth,
 85 for each generation step we count the life cycles present in the population. The
 86 life cycle which makes up the largest fraction of the lattice at that generation
 87 step is the winner at that time, i.e., a local winner. We proceed this way until
 88 the winning life cycle stops changing, thus, becomes the global winner. Of
 89 course, if two even life cycles (e.g., $k = 2$ and $k = 4$) have an odd emergence
 90 phase shift, they will never encounter each other and are completely unable to
 91 compete directly. This situation never happens between two prime numbered

92 life cycles.

93 **3 Results and Discussion**

94 For our simulation runs we used a maximum generation time (t_{max}) of 10^6 ,
95 which proved to be enough simulation time to find a global winner (data not
96 shown). We set $L = 100$ and $d = 24$ for all simulation runs performed. The
97 other parameters were varied to observe the effects of different initial popula-
98 tion size and dispersal threshold. It's important to point out that for each run
99 a parameter set is kept fixed. For each parameter set 1000 independent runs
100 were executed.

101 First of all, let's explore the effect of different initially occupied fraction of the
102 lattice at fixed dispersal threshold M . We can observe in Fig. 1 the very sharp
103 rising of the occupied fraction x , starting the simulation with $x_0 = 0.1$ and a
104 much slower variation in the case $x_0 = 0.5$. This difference is explained easily
105 when one looks at global winner distribution of both situations. Starting with
106 a small x_0 , the rapid spread of short lived strains is facilitated. However, this
107 spreading is clearly cooperative as suggested by the sharp rising curve. An
108 increasing in the short lived strains implies in a greater probability of colo-
109 nization and vice-versa. On the other hand, a larger x_0 geometrically prevents
110 this fast spreading simply because the clusters of short lived strains are now
111 blocked by clusters of long lived strains. Of course, even in this condition,
112 short lived strains are commonly the global winners. But now, we can see a
113 more varied distribution of winners. Compare Fig. 2 and Fig. 3.

114 In second place, we start to observe the effect of varied dispersal threshold.
115 A clear predominance of short lived cicadas as the global winners is seen
116 for $M = 2$. It could not be different. A small dispersal threshold requires low
117 populational densities, as said before, to ensure colonization. Consequently, life
118 cycles more active on average (i.e., the short ones) tend to spread rapidly over
119 the empty patches before any reaction from the other life cycles. This is exactly
120 what is observed in Fig. 4. Setting $M = 3$ changes completely the scenario. In
121 Fig. 5, one can see an evident hegemony of prime numbered life cycles. With
122 this parameter set, on average, each active patch will compete with more than
123 three other active sites for colonization. Therefore, competition is in a much
124 higher level than in the $M = 2$ case. Now, let's turn our attention to the
125 $M = 4$ case. As seen before, there is a predominance of cicadas with prime
126 numbered life cycles as the global winners. Moreover, the majority of life cycles
127 are well represented in the global winners histogram (Fig. 6). It is important
128 to note that at this level of dispersal threshold is virtually impossible to fill up
129 the entire lattice. In fact, the initial population grows just marginally before
130 reaching the steady state. This is due to a geometrical border effect. In such

131 case, the growth of the global population is strongly self-limited. The same
132 will occur to $M > 4$. Actually, for $M > 4$ no appreciable growth and/or spread
133 of the population could be observed.

134 4 Conclusion

135 In the present contribution, we showed that a very simple competitive dy-
136 namics, spatially structured, with few parameters can exhibit a reasonable
137 diversity of behaviors. But, the main point here is that, differently from the ma-
138 jority of works on this subject, we demonstrated in a simple and direct manner
139 the insufficiency of predation to ensure the emergence of prime numbered life
140 cycles as the most effective ones in the dynamic. In our model, in which only
141 competition can change the fate of the different strains, the simplest way of
142 avoiding competition is to reduce the chance of interaction between different
143 strains. For this purpose, prime numbered life cycles have the least tendency
144 for interaction in the long run. And more, this model indicates that prime
145 numbered life cycles experience a type of kin selection. In this manner, they
146 tend to interact preferentially with other prime numbered ones rather than
147 with non prime numbered. In the end, there's no need for *ad hoc* explanations
148 for the success of those life cycles. Our result points towards competition be-
149 tween the different strains as responsible for the emergence of prime numbered
150 life cycles. This result contrasts sharply with those in [2,6], in which a much
151 more complicated dynamics is explored. Specifically, we reproduced the results
152 of [6] with and without the presence of predators. The only detectable differ-
153 ence was a shift to the right in the global winner histogram (data not shown
154 here). It could not be different, as the chance of interaction is high between
155 short life cycle strains and predators. In this respect, our model could be seen
156 as a reinterpretation of the models presented in [2,6] without mutation and
157 predation. But, as one can see, we obtained very similar results. Finally, we
158 hope that this simple contribution can help to elucidate this very interesting
159 puzzle of Nature by showing how simple mechanisms can generate unexpected
160 (and amazing) results.

161 Acknowledgements

162 We thank P. R. A. Campos for valuable discussions and for initial inspiration.
163 The work of D A. M. M. S. is supported by CAPES. G. O. C. and A. C. were
164 supported by FAPESP.

165 **References**

- 166 [1] N. Lehmann-Ziebarth, P. P. Heideman, R. A. Shapiro, S. L. Stoddart, C. C. L.
167 Hsiao, G. R. Stephenson, P. A. Milewski, A. R. Ives, Evolution of periodicity
168 in periodical cicadas, *Ecology* 86 (2005) 3200–3211.
- 169 [2] E. Goles, O. Schulz, M. Markus, A biological generator of prime numbers,
170 *Nonlinear Phenom. Complex Systems* 3 (2000) 208–213.
- 171 [3] H. Behncke, Periodical cicadas, *J. Math. Biol.* 40 (2000) 413–431.
- 172 [4] G. F. Webb, The prime number periodical cicada problem, *Discrete Contin.*
173 *Dyn. Syst.-Ser. B* 1 (2001) 387–399.
- 174 [5] B. Hayes, Bugs that count, *Am. Scientist* 92 (2004) 401–405.
- 175 [6] P. R. A. Campos, V. M. de Oliveira, R. Giro, D. S. Galvao, Emergence of prime
176 numbers as the result of evolutionary strategy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93.
- 177 [7] K. S. Williams, C. Simon, The ecology, behavior, and evolution of periodical
178 cicadas, *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 40 (1995) 269–295.
- 179 [8] K. Heliovaara, R. Vaisanen, C. Simon, Evolutionary ecology of periodical
180 insects, *Trends In Ecology & Evolution* 9 (1994) 475–480.
- 181 [9] M. Lloyd, H. S. Dybas, Periodical cicada problem. i. population ecology,
182 *Evolution* 20 (1966) 133–&.
- 183 [10] M. Lloyd, H. S. Dybas, Periodical cicada problem. ii. evolution, *Evolution* 20
184 (1966) 466–&.
- 185 [11] F. C. Hoppensteadt, J. B. Keller, Synchronization of periodical cicada
186 emergencies, *Science* 194 (1976) 335–337.
- 187 [12] M. G. Bulmer, Periodical insects, *Am. Nat.* 111 (1977) 1099–1117.
- 188 [13] R. T. Cox, C. E. Carlton, Paleoclimatic influences in the evolution of periodical
189 cicadas (insecta, homoptera, cicadidae, *magicicada* spp), *Am. Midl. Nat.* 120
190 (1988) 183–193.
- 191 [14] J. Yoshimura, The evolutionary origins of periodical cicadas during ice ages,
192 *Am. Nat.* 149 (1997) 112–124.
- 193 [15] R. T. Cox, C. E. Carlton, A commentary on prime numbers and life cycles of
194 periodical cicadas, *Am. Nat.* 152 (1998) 162–164.
- 195 [16] P. R. Grant, The priming of periodical cicada life cycles, *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 20
196 (2005) 169–174.
- 197 [17] M. T. Burrows, S. J. Hawkins, Modelling patch dynamics on rocky shores using
198 deterministic cellular automata, *Mar. Ecol.-Prog. Ser.* 167 (1998) 1–13.

199 Fig. 1: Temporal evolution of the occupied fraction of the lattice (x) for dis-
200 persal threshold $M = 2$ and initial occupied fraction x_0 as indicated in the
201 graph. This graph is for just one run, but it represents significantly the model's
202 general behavior.

203

204 Fig. 2: Distribution of the global winner for initial occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.1$
205 and dispersal threshold $M = 2$ in 1000 independent runs.

206

207 Fig. 3: Distribution of the global winner for initial occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.5$
208 and dispersal threshold $M = 2$ in 1000 independent runs.

209

210 Fig. 4: Distribution of the global winner for initial occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.5$
211 and dispersal threshold $M = 3$ in 1000 independent runs. The dominance of
212 prime numbered life cycles is evident.

213


214 Fig. 5: Distribution of the global winner for initial occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.5$
215 and dispersal threshold $M = 4$ in 1000 independent runs. Again, the domi-
216 nance of prime numbered life cycles is evident, but, to a lesser extent in this
217 case.

218


219 Fig. 6: Temporal evolution of the occupied fraction of the lattice (x) for initial
220 occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.5$ and dispersal threshold as indicated in the graph.
221 As stated in sec. 3, the growth for $M = 4$ is strongly limited.

222


223




224




225




226



227



228



229