

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 has 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. But, 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 an 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] and based on [16], we assume com-
49 petition 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 of
59 a complete lattice update. We do the following during the generation update
60 for all lattice sites. At each generation step, all occupied sites have its age
61 incremented by 1. When colonized patch has age equal to its life cycle length
62 ($t_i(t) = k$) we say that it is in the active state. Biologically, this corresponds
63 to the adult part of the cicada life cycle. Individuals can only interact directly
64 during this phase of its life cycle. On the other hand, every time an empty
65 patch (inactive site) is found we look at its closest neighborhood (Moore
66 neighborhood with range 1) and count the number of active patches. If the
67 number of these is greater or equal to the dispersal threshold parameter K ,
68 that empty patch will be eventually colonized. After this, a randomly chosen
69 active patch is picked from the neighborhood and those individuals will be re-
70 sponsible for the colonization of the empty patch. The newly colonized patch
71 has the same life cycle length of its colonizer and age set to zero. This pro-
72 cess is biologically reasonable and mimics very well a competitive dynamics
73 between the different strains of cicadas. The parameter K can be viewed as
74 measure of a tendency for dispersal of the population. Therefore, for small K
75 there is a high tendency for dispersal and we need small populational density
76 to have that. Conversely, a large K implies in a high populational density in
77 order to promote dispersal. At the end of a generation step, all active patches
78 have their age set to zero and the whole process begin again. Finally, at the
79 end of a generation step, all active sites have its age set to zero.

80 For each simulation run, a set of initial conditions is defined this way. A
81 squared central seed is put at the lattice. The size of the central seed is con-
82 trolled by the parameter x_0 which defines the fraction of the lattice that is
83 initially occupied. For each of these patches, a life cycle and a age are selected
84 randomly from a uniform distribution according with the limits imposed by
85 the parameters d and K , respectively. Therefore, the initial population is a
86 random mixture of all possible life cycles in a complete desynchronized fashion.
87 Our main interest is to study the long term behavior of this kind of system.
88 For each generation step we count the life cycles present in the population.
89 The life cycle which makes up the large fraction of the lattice at that gen-
90 eration step is the winner at that time, i.e., a local winner. We proceed this
91 way until the winning life cycle stops changing, thus, becomes the global win-

92 ner. Of course, if two even life cycles (e.g., $k = 2$ and $k = 4$) with an odd
93 emergence phase shift are the survivors, they will never encounter each other
94 again. In fact, they are completely unable to compete directly and both will
95 remain forever. This type of result does not compromise further conclusions.
96 Even in this situation, there is a global winner.

97 **3 Results and Discussion**

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

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

118 In second place, we start to observe the effect of varied dispersal threshold.
119 A clear predominance of short lived cicadas as the global winners is seen for
120 $K = 2$. It could not be different. A small dispersal threshold requires low
121 populational densities, as said before, to ensure colonization. Consequently,
122 life cycles more active on average (i.e., the short ones) tend to spread rapidly
123 over the empty patches before any reaction from the other life cycles. This
124 is exactly what is observed in Fig. 4. Setting $K = 3$ changes completely the
125 scenario. In Fig. 5, one can see a evident hegemony of prime numbered life
126 cycles. With this parameter set, on average, each active patch will compete
127 with two or more other active sites for colonization. Therefore, competition is
128 in a much higher level than in the $K = 2$ case. Now, let's turn our attention to
129 the $K = 4$ case. As seen before, there is a predominance of cicadas with prime
130 numbered life cycles as the global winners. Moreover, the majority of life cycles

131 are well represented in the global winners histogram (Fig. 6). It is important
132 to note that at this level of dispersal threshold is virtually impossible to fill up
133 the entire lattice. In fact, the initial population grows just marginally before
134 reaching the steady state. This is due to a geometrical border effect. In such
135 case, the growth of the global population is strongly self-limited. The same
136 will occur to $K > 4$. Actually, for $K > 4$ no appreciable growth and/or spread
137 of the population could be observed.

138 4 Conclusion

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

162 Acknowledgements

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

166 **References**

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

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

204
205 Fig. 2: Steady state distribution of the global winner for for dispersal thresh-
206 old $k = 2$ and initial occupied fraction $x_0 = 0.1$ in 1000 independent runs.


207
208 Fig. 3: Steady state distribution of the global winner for initial occupied frac-
209 tion $x_0 = 0.5$ and dispersal threshold $k = 2$ in 1000 independent runs.

210
211 Fig. 4: Steady state distribution of the global winner for initial occupied frac-
212 tion $x_0 = 0.5$ and dispersal threshold $k = 3$ in 1000 independent runs. The
213 dominance of prime-numbered life cycles is evident.


214
215 Fig. 5: Steady state distribution of the global winner for initial occupied frac-
216 tion $x_0 = 0.5$ and dispersal threshold $k = 4$ in 1000 independent runs. Again,
217 the dominance of prime-numbered life cycles is evident, to a lesser extent in
218 this case.

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


223




224




225




226



227



228



229