

Random topologies and the emergence of cooperation: the role of short-cuts

Daniele Vilone^{1,*}, Angel Sánchez^{1,2,3}, and Jesús Gómez-Gardeñes^{3,4}

¹ Grupo Interdisciplinar de Sistemas Complejos (GISC), Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, 28911 Leganés, Madrid, Spain

² Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, 28049 Cantoblanco, Madrid, Spain

³ Instituto de Biocomputación y Física de Sistemas Complejos, Universidad de Zaragoza, Campus Río Ebro, 50018 Zaragoza, Spain

⁴ Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, 28933 Móstoles, Madrid, Spain

* E-mail: daniele.vilone@gmail.com

Abstract. We present a detailed study about the role of the short-cuts of a network in promoting the emergence of cooperation in a population of agents playing the Prisoner's Dilemma Game (PDG). We introduce a model which allows to tune the topology of the system from the one-dimensional euclidean lattice (a ring) to the complete graph just changing the value of one parameter (the probability p to add a link between two nodes not already connected in the euclidean configuration). We show that there is a region of values of p in which cooperation is largely enhanced, whilst for smaller values of p only a few cooperators are present in the final state, and for $p \rightarrow 1^-$ cooperation is totally suppressed. We present analytical arguments that provide a very plausible interpretation of the simulation results. Our work makes it clear how short-cuts can be decisive in promoting (or suppressing) cooperation in the absence of other mechanisms such as clustering. Implications for other dynamics are also drawn.

PACS: 02.50.Le, 89.75.-k

1. Introduction

Cooperative behaviours are commonly observed in nature and in human society. However, explaining its origin is not a trivial task [1–3]. Indeed, at the level of individuals, very often a selfish attitude is more convenient (as can be easily seen in lots of animal behaviours), so that there must be some peculiar mechanisms that promote a sort of crossover from the “micro” level (*i.e.* in the interactions between a few individuals), to the “macro” one (when a great number of individuals is involved), where cooperation in many cases prevails over defection, reverting the trend of the former case.

Already Nowak and May [4] suggested that the topology of interactions could be a fundamental factor enhancing the emergence of cooperation even though the interaction

at the individual level, as for example in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game (PDG), is dominated by defection. A wealth of studies on evolutionary game theory on graphs spawned from this first, key insight [5,6]. The outcome of all that research is that the influence of the topology is not universal in general, and many factors can favour (or hinder) global cooperative behaviours, as for instance the update rule the individuals use to evolve their strategies (see Section 4 below) or the details of the topology [7]. Therefore, it is worth improving our understanding of the role of both topology and update rules in enhancing (or preventing) cooperation.

Previous research has identified a few key topological features that are very important for the dynamics. Prominent among those is the clustering coefficient, which measures the local density of connections. Highly clustered networks can promote the survival of initially cooperating agents as they interact mainly among themselves, subsequently fostering the spreading of their strategy throughout the whole system [4,7–9]. The degree distribution and in particular whether it is of exponential type or has a long tail (scale free in general) has also been shown to lead to dramatical differences [10,11]. Another relevant factor to take into account is the size of the network and how it converges (if at all) to the thermodynamic limit. An example of a system that behaves very differently according to whether it has finite size or it is in the thermodynamical limit is the voter model on small-world [12] Watts-Strogatz (WS) networks [13]: Here, the final state shows coexistence of states for $L \rightarrow \infty$, whilst if L remains finite the system ends up in a uniform state (L being the size of the system). In this respect, it is important to note that the WS network has the interesting property of behaving locally like an euclidean lattice but globally like a random network (thus having high clustering coefficient and low diameter) as we will see in Section 3. However, in spite of the above hints that small-world-like networks may have unusual properties, no research so far has addressed the issue of the role of short-cuts, the main topological ingredient of those networks, in detail. Therefore, in this paper we will focus on a model network inspired by the WS one, but with some remarkable differences with respect to it. Such model will allow us to gain valuable insights on the role played by short-cuts in the emergence and sustainability of cooperation.

The article has the following structure: In Section 2 we summarize the available results about the PDG played by agents in a structured population. Subsequently, in Section 3 we introduce the topology of the network which we use as the tool of the study (a generalization of the small-world network with new links added with probability p to the ones already present in a regular one-dimensional ring). Section 4 presents our main results, followed in Section 5 by some theoretical interpretations and implications. Finally, in Section 6 we summarize our conclusions and discuss the future perspectives they open.

2. The Prisoner's Dilemma Game and the evolution of cooperation

The PDG is the framework of choice to investigate the emergence and stability of cooperation in most contexts, from economy through microbiology to social psychology. In order to make connections with this large body of literature, we will focus on the effects of short-cuts on the PDG. As a game-theoretical model, the PDG was first formalized by Rapoport and Chammah in 1965 [14]. It is a 2×2 symmetric game; each player can cooperate (C), or defect (D). If both players cooperate, they get a reward R , if both defect they get instead a punishment P , and finally if they adopt different strategies the defector earns the temptation payoff T , whilst the cooperator receives the sucker's one S . In the PDG the values of the former payoffs are ordered as $T > R > P \geq S$. Therefore, the unique Nash equilibrium (a choice of strategies for the players from which none of them has incentives to deviate, see, e.g., [15]) is mutual defection, even though this is not a Pareto optimal solution, i.e. there exists another configuration, mutual cooperation, in which both players would earn more. Thus, the point is that cooperation is not the rational choice by the two opponents as it always pays to one of them to switch to defection: There lies the dilemma.

While the Nash equilibrium concept corresponds to a classical game theory framework, in which two rational players interact only once, in the evolutionary game theory version, we have N individuals playing the PDG among themselves, and after each round of game they may change their strategy according to some microscopical update rule based on the result of the game. Essentially, the game proceeds as follows: At the initial step every individual plays with a subset of the players (possibly with all) and receives a total payoff according to her strategy and her partners' one. After that, the players decide to keep the strategy used, or to change it, according to an *a priori* specified update rule. It is clear that there are certain features to fix in order to define coherently the evolutionary game. These include the decision on with whom every agent plays each time and how she decides the strategy for the following round of the game (equivalently, how the microscopical update rule for the strategies works). When speaking of evolutionary game theory on graphs [5], the key point is that the subset of the players with whom a given one interacts is the set of her neighbours; this, in turn, is prescribed by the topology of the system. Thus, in a complete graph all the individuals are directly connected (and then we speak of the well-mixed population case or limit); in an euclidean square bidimensional lattice every agent interacts with its four nearest neighbours, and so on. Of course, in a complex network the structure can be very complicated, and the number of neighbours will be in general different for each agent.

Following Nowak and May [4] we will work in this work with parameters $R = 1$, $T = b \in (1, 2]$ and $P = S = 0$: This choice (often referred to as the “weak PDG”) does not change the essential physics of the model, and makes the study easier, because it reduces to one the number of free parameters, which is important as we will later use another independent parameter for characterizing the network. It is easy to

show [5, 15–17] that in a well-mixed population, that is, on a complete graph, a system of agents playing the PDG ends up in a frozen state with only defectors, independently of the particular update rule adopted by the agents, and in agreement with the fact that the Nash equilibrium of the 2×2 game is the mutual defection. On the other hand, it is known that when the population structure is a lattice, the system may converge to a final state with a non vanishing density of survived cooperators [4, 5, 7, 17, 18]. This fact led to the suggestion that a non trivial topology could enhance in general the emergence of cooperation in a population playing the PDG. However, as already mentioned, the effect of the topology is not universal, mainly because it also depends strongly on the update rule adopted by the players [7, 18–21] and not only on the particular topology. It is necessary then to investigate in more depth how cooperation can emerge and survive (or be suppressed) in different topologies and with different microscopical update rules, in order to identify generic mechanisms that allow to understand the problem from a wider perspective. This is what we do here regarding the specific role of short-cuts.

3. The network

The original formulation of a small-world network was carried out by Watts and Strogatz [13], and a thorough study of its properties can be found in reference [22]. Here we are just going to summarize the main features of the original Watts-Strogatz (WS) model and of a variant of it, the link-added small-world network (LASW). In this article we are going to exploit the LASW network instead of the WS one since we are more interested in the continuous transition from the 1D topology to a totally connected graph through the establishment of short-cuts than in the one from 1D to a random network. Anyway, we provide here a very short review of both models, because they share some useful features.

In both SW and LASW models we start from a regular one-dimensional ring with L nodes: each site is connected with its $2k$ nearest neighbours ($k \in \mathbb{N}$), so that we have kL links (or edges). The diameter D_0 (i.e., the average distance between two randomly chosen nodes) and the clustering coefficient $\chi_0(k)$ (i.e., the probability that two neighbours of a third one are also neighbours of each other) of such a simple graph are [22]

$$D_0 = \frac{L}{2k} , \tag{1}$$

$$\chi_0(k) = \frac{3(k-1)}{2(2k-1)} . \tag{2}$$

At this point, we can modify this ring in two possible ways: by adding new links, or by rewiring the already existing ones. In the former case (LASW) we add each missing connection with probability p , in the latter one (WS) we instead change the "destination" of each existing link with probability p_r (without adding new edges). Therefore, for link-added graphs, by varying p we can tune the topology from euclidean

to complete-network; on the contrary, for rewired graphs, by varying p_r , we go from euclidean to a totally random topology, the so-called Erdős-Rényi topology [23].

3.1. WS networks (rewired networks)

As shown in [13] and [22], the diameter of WS networks is given by the following expression

$$D = D_0 \cdot f(2kp_r) , \quad (3)$$

where the quantity $x = 2kp_r$ is the density of short-cuts per site, and

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \rightarrow 0^+, \\ \frac{\log(x)}{x}, & x \gg 1. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Moreover, the clustering coefficient is in this case given by

$$\chi(p_r, k) = \begin{cases} \chi_0(k), & p_r \lesssim 1/10, \\ \chi_0 \cdot \varepsilon, & p_r \gtrsim 1/10, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

with $1 > \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ for $p_r \rightarrow 1^-$. Of course, for $k = 1$ we have $\chi(p_r) = 0 \ \forall p_r \in [0, 1]$.

3.2. LASW networks (link-added networks)

In this new case, it is easy to determine that for this kind of graphs the diameter is given by

$$D = D_0 \cdot f[(L - 2k - 1)p] ; \quad (6)$$

the quantity $x = (L - 2k - 1)p$ is the density of short-cuts per site in this model and $f(x)$ is the same function given in Eq. (4). At the same time, the clustering coefficient is given in the thermodynamical limit by

$$\chi(p, k) = \begin{cases} \chi_0(k), & p = 0, \\ p, & p \in (0, 1] , \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Notice how for $p \neq 0$ the clustering coefficient is exactly given by the link adding probability. The previous expression can be found directly by taking the limit $L \rightarrow +\infty$ in the general result for the clustering coefficient

$$\chi_L(p, k) = z \cdot [\chi_0(k) + [1 - \chi_0(k)] \cdot p] + (1 - z) \cdot p ,$$

where $z = z(L, p, k) = 2k/\bar{n}(L, p, k)$ is the probability that two nodes are not neighbours in the one-dimensional ring, and $\bar{n} = 2k + p(L - 1 - 2k)$ is the average number of neighbours per site. It must be noticed that, except for the case $k = 1$, the sequence of functions $\chi_L(p, k)$, *i.e.* the sequence of cluster coefficients given by different values of L , does not converge uniformly to $\chi(p, k)$ given in Eq. (7).




Figure 1. Degree distribution $P(m)$ of a LASW network with $L = 400$, $k = 1$, $p = 0.25$ (full line), and of an ER randomgraph with $L = 400$, $p = 0.25$ (dashed line). The two distributions are practically identical, with a slight translation $m \rightarrow m + 2k$ for the LASW case, for which $p \gg p^* = 0.005$, due to the presence of the regular "euclidean" links.

It is worth highlighting some remarkable topological features, which will be useful below. First of all, let us consider for simplicity the case $L \gg 2k + 1$, that is $L - 2k - 1 \simeq L$. Now, calling $p^* = 2k/L$, we have a crossover in the behaviour of a LASW network. For $p \ll p^*$ the number of short-cuts is still much smaller than the number of regular links. This means that the system behaves similarly to a WS small-world network with $p_r = Lp/(2k)$. More precisely, for $p \lesssim p^*$ Eq. (6) reduces exactly to Eq. (3), whilst the clustering coefficient given in Eq. (7) differs for $k \geq 2$ from the one given by Eq. (5) only for the fact that it decreases to $\chi_0(k)/2$ instead of approaching 0 for $p_r \rightarrow 1^-$ (for $k = 1$ the clustering coefficient is always zero for WS networks, and at most of the order $\sim 2k/L \ll 1$ for LASW ones). Therefore, it is correct to state that in this regime the LASW model is practically equivalent to the WS small-world model. Analogously, in the opposite limit $p \gg p^*$, the number of added links is much larger than that of regular ones, and thus the behaviour of the system will be similar to that of an Erdős-Rényi (ER) random network [23], as it is shown in Fig. 1. In fact, any LASW network is in practice the sum of a regular graph and a ER one, so that its degree distribution $P(m)$ is always equal to $P_{ER}(m + 2k)$, $P_{ER}(m)$ being the equivalent distribution of an ER network with the same p and L (see again Fig. 1), *i.e.* a binomial distribution with mean value pL and variance $p(1 - p)L$.

On the other hand, in the thermodynamical limit ($L \rightarrow +\infty$) we have that $p^* \rightarrow 0^+$ so that a LASW network behaves exactly like an ER one $\forall p \in (0, 1]$, and neither the diameter nor the clustering coefficient of a LASW network depend anymore on k (except the case of $\chi(p = 0, k) = \chi_0(k)$). Moreover, the clustering coefficient for $k \geq 2$ becomes equal to the value it has exactly for $k = 1$. In practice, for very large networks, studying




Figure 2. The behaviour of the cooperator density ρ_C in the asymptotic state for a graph with $k = 1$, $L = 1000$, and $b = 1.05$ (circles) and $b = 1.25$ (diamonds), as a function of the link-adding probability p , is shown. All agents use the UI update rule. Note the logarithmic scale of the x axis.

the simplest case $k = 1$ is already enough to understand the general behaviour of the model, and therefore we will focus on this case for most of the remainder of the paper.

4. PDG on LASW networks: Simulation results

Having introduced our model network, we now turn to investigating how the topology influences the emergence of cooperation in a population whose individuals play the PDG. Concerning the microscopical update rules which can be used, even though there are many possible choices in literature [5,7,16], we present here only the two most commonly considered ones: Unconditional imitation (UI) and replicator rule (REP). The former is a completely deterministic rule: At the end of each round of the game, every player imitates the strategy of the neighbour which has obtained the best payoff, provided there is at least one neighbour with a larger payoff than hers own. In the replicator update agents choose at random a neighbour: If the payoff of the chosen neighbour is lower than the agent's own, nothing happens. If it is larger, the agent will adopt the neighbour's strategy with a probability proportional to the difference between the two payoffs. These two rules differ in character (deterministic *versus* stochastic) and in their outcomes in the presence of a homogeneous network structure: indeed, UI promotes very much the appearance of cooperation whereas REP does not [4, 7, 18, 19]. In addition, they are among the most common choices in literature. Therefore, while these two rules are by no means the whole panorama of possible dynamics, they will allow us to obtain widely applicable results and to gain insight on different mechanisms. Finally, we will study here essentially LASW networks with $k = 1$ because, as discussed in Section 3 above, in the limit of large L the network features do not depend anymore on k .




Figure 3. The behaviour of the cooperator density ρ_C in the asymptotic state for a graph with $k = 1$, $L = 400$, and $b = 1.05$ (circles) and $b = 1.25$ (diamonds), as a function of the link-adding probability p , is shown. All agents use the REP update rule. Note the logarithmic scale of the x axis.

Let us begin from the case of a one-dimensional ring, that is, the case $p = 0$, starting from an initial configuration with fifty percent of cooperators, and with UI as the update rule. Numerical simulations show that the final cooperator density is around 0.14 for each value of $b \in (1, 2]$ (we will give an analytical explanation for this value in Sec. 5 below). On the other hand, in the opposite limit, $p = 1$, the topology corresponds to a fully connected network, and thus there are no cooperators in the final configuration (see Section 2). It is worth then to investigate what happens for intermediate values of the link-adding probability p . In Fig. 2 we report the behaviour of the final density of cooperators on a system with UI dynamics, size $L = 1000$, temptation $b = 1.05$ and 1.25 , and initial cooperator density equal to 0.5. The results are really intriguing: For $p \in [0.002, 0.2]$ ($b = 1.05$), and for $p \in [0.002, 0.02]$ ($b = 1.25$) there is a large plateau where cooperation is dramatically enhanced with respect to both the one-dimensional ring ($p = 0$) and, of course, the complete graph ($p = 1$). Therefore, such plateaus point out the existence of an optimal region of the link-adding probability starting at $p \simeq p^*$. As observed from Fig. 2 the length of the optimal region decreases with b , as is the case with the cooperator density as well. It is noticeable that the same picture emerges when the update rule used in the system is the REP one, as clearly shown in Fig. 3: In this case we also see an optimal region of the link-adding probability (starting at $p \simeq p^*$) in which cooperation is very large. This means that, apart from the (expected, [7, 18]) smaller levels of cooperation in each stage with respect to the UI system, the fundamental mechanism underlying such phenomenon cannot be due to the update rule chosen, but to the topological features of the network.

It is interesting to consider the case in which there are different dynamics present in the system. Recently, Roca *et al.* [24] showed that this may induce further enhancements of the cooperation. However, in our case, we have verified that when update rules




Figure 4. The behaviour of the cooperator density ρ_C in the asymptotic state for a graph with $k = 1$, $L = 1000$ and $b = 1.05$, as a function of the link-adding probability p , is shown. The system includes the two update strategies (half of the agents use the UI rule, half the REP one). The update rules did not evolve in time.

coexist in the population, the phenomenology remains practically unchanged, as shown in Figure 4. It must be remarked that also in such mixed dynamics UI rule enhances cooperation more than REP one, coherently with the results presented in the literature mentioned above. Finally, we note also that the cooperation levels of the two fractions of the population are similar to those observed when the corresponding rule is the only one used, providing further evidence of the independence of the results of the update rule considered. It is thus clear that the existence of an optimal range of short-cut density is due to structural features and thus it should be explained in topological terms.

The above results correspond to the case $k = 1$, which as explained above we expect to be representative of the evolutionary outcomes for larger values of the initial degree. This is indeed verified in Fig. 5, where results for $k = 2$ and different systems sizes are shown. Our numerics confirm the existence of a similar transition at $p \simeq p^* = 2k/L$, where a plateau of large cooperation densities is observed until this magnitude begins to decrease as $p \rightarrow 1^-$. It should be noted, however, that there is an interesting difference with respect to the case $k = 1$ that arises from the behaviour for $p \rightarrow 0^-$. In this limit, the cooperative behaviour in the frozen state is very high but, as we will see in the next Section, this is due to the different geometrical properties of an euclidean ring with $k \geq 2$. Notwithstanding this special feature, the main conclusion of Fig. 5 is that for $p \gtrsim p^*$ the behaviour of the system is independent of k .

Finally, we have also analyzed the case in which strategies and strategy update rules co-evolve, a line of work that has attracted much interest recently [16]. We will consider the approach proposed in [17], in which agents that decide to copy the strategy of a neighbor copy her strategy update rule as well. Recent results [25] show that such




Figure 5. The behaviour of the cooperator density ρ_C in the asymptotic state for a graph with $k = 2$ and $b = 1.05$, as a function of the link-adding probability p , is shown. All agents use the UI update rule. Note the logarithmic scale of the x axis.




Figure 6. The behaviour of the cooperator density ρ_C in the asymptotic state for a graph with $k = 1$, $L = 2000$ and $p = 0.01$, as a function of the temptation b and of the density $F_{ui}(0)$ of imitators in the initial stage, is shown by means of a color scale. Update rules (UI and REP) coevolve with the strategies as described in the text; initial density of cooperators equal to 0.5. Note that the larger $F_{ui}(0)$, the larger the asymptotic level of cooperation.

a co-evolutionary process gives rise to different results depending on the topologies and the rules that are initially present in the population. We have therefore carried out simulations with both strategy update rules present in the population in different initial fractions, and allowing them to be adopted as described above. Figure 6 shows that even with evolving update rules, around $p \simeq 0.01$ cooperation is once again promoted, for values up to about $b \simeq 1.4$. This is a further hint on the robustness of the cooperation enhancement process due to the short-cuts. In accordance with the results above, we note that the range in which the cooperation is enhanced decreases with the density of initial replicators. Therefore, all our results show that there are some values of p (and thus of the clustering coefficient, – see Section 3), in which cooperative behaviour is largely enhanced regardless of the initial degree of the network and of the evolutionary dynamics. In the next Section we give some theoretical explanations of this phenomenon, which certainly plays an important role in the promotion of cooperation on complex networks.

5. Discussion

5.1. One-dimensional ring

Let us start our analysis from the simplest case: the one-dimensional ring with $k = 1$ (i.e. the case with two neighbours, one left and one right, per site), in which agents play PDG with UI as microscopical update rule. We will begin by showing that the asymptotic cooperation density does not depend on b . Having $b \in (1, 2]$, this is an immediate consequence of the remarkable property of the dynamics that a defector never changes strategy: Indeed, a defector surrounded by at least one cooperator earns at each game a payoff $\Pi \geq b > 1$, whilst a cooperator surrounded by at least one defector earns a payoff $\tilde{\Pi} \leq 1 < \Pi$, so that a D -strategist will never find a better performing neighbour with C strategy. Thus, the evolution of the system is independent from the value of b , provided $b > 1$. Furthermore, it follows that the cooperator density is a decreasing function of time: $\rho_c^\infty \leq \rho_0$, where $\rho_c^\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_c(t)$ and $\rho_0 = \rho_c(t = 0)$ are the final and initial cooperator densities respectively.

As a second result, we will now show that a necessary condition for a cooperator not to change strategy is to be set in the middle of a cluster of at least three consecutive cooperators. To this end, let us note that a configuration of the form $DDCCDD$ is stable, because the payoffs of the players are respectively $\leq b, b, 1, 2, 1, b, \leq b$, thus the defectors and the central cooperator do not have any reason to change, while the cooperators in the boundary of their cluster imitate the central one, and hence they keep the C strategy. Nevertheless, reasoning as above, it must be noticed that a configuration $DCCDC$ evolves to $DCCDDD$ and finally to $DDDDDD$. In general, isolated defectors give birth to a triplet of D -strategists: $\dots CCCCDCCCC \dots$ goes to $\dots CCCDDDCCC \dots$, which is a stable configuration.

Having the above considerations in mind, we can say that the final cooperator

density must be directly proportional to the density of clusters of at least three consecutive cooperators in the initial state, minus the effect of the initially isolated defectors $\alpha(\rho_0)$. Then, we can write down

$$\rho_C = 3(1 - \rho_0)\rho_0^3(1 - \rho_0) + 4(1 - \rho_0)\rho_0^4(1 - \rho_0) + \dots - \alpha(\rho_0) , \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha(x) \in [0, 1)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} \alpha(x) = 0$. The previous equation can be rewritten as

$$\rho_C = \rho_0^3(1 - \rho_0)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (j+3)\rho_0^j - \alpha(\rho_0) = \rho_0^3 \cdot (3 - 2\rho_0) - \alpha(\rho_0) . \quad (9)$$

As in our simulations we always started from $\rho_0 = 0.5$, we have to evaluate the correction term $\alpha(\rho_0 = 0.5)$. This can be cumbersome, but the most important correction around $\rho_0 \simeq 0.5$ is that arising from configurations of the form $\dots DCC \dots CCDCC \dots CCD \dots$, *i.e.* two clusters of consecutive *C*-strategists being made up by at least three cooperators. Each of such initial configurations leads to the removal of the two cooperators surrounding the central defector. In fact the effect is somewhat larger, because some clusters with 3 cooperators are removed when they are close to a larger cooperator cluster as explained above. Ignoring this effect as a first approximation we can compute

$$\alpha(\rho_0) \simeq 3P_3(1 - \rho_0)P_3 = \frac{3\rho_0^6}{1 - \rho_0} , \quad (10)$$

with

$$P_3 = (1 - \rho_0)^2 \cdot (\rho_0^3 + \rho_0^4 + \rho_0^5 + \dots) = \rho_0^3(1 - \rho_0)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \rho_0^j = \frac{\rho_0^3}{1 - \rho_0} .$$

Then, in the case of a one-dimensional ring with degree equal to 2 and $\rho_0 = 0.5$, from equations (9) and (10) we find $\rho_C \simeq 0.156$, with an 8% error respect to the measured value of about 0.143. This good agreement shows that we have indeed identified the main mechanisms governing the evolution in the one-dimensional ring. Note also that this reasoning is valid for rules such as UI and REP, where there is no possibility of making mistakes, *i.e.* one node never copies the strategy of a neighbor with smaller payoff. In this context, it is worth noticing that the model discussed in this subsection is very close to the one described by Eshel and coworkers [26], where mistakes are possible and defectors (called "egoists" in the paper by Eshel *et al.*) can at some point become cooperators ("altruists").

5.2. The role of short-cuts

Let us now consider the case of $p > 0$ (always with $k = 1$). It is easy to see that the presence of short-cuts changes in general the stability of a configuration. In particular, it is no longer true that $\rho_C^\infty \leq \rho_0$. Indeed, think of a long cluster of defectors, a configuration which is stable in a ring. If we connect one of the internal agents with a far away cooperator surrounded by two other *C*-strategists, at the subsequent step

the long-range connected defector will flip toward cooperation. More generally, the fact that a defector can be directly connected with more than two cooperators makes the transition $D \rightarrow C$ possible, so that ρ_C^∞ is expected to increase with p increasing, at least for small values of the link adding probability. On the other hand, in the limit $p \rightarrow 1^-$ we know that the cooperation level must vanish [17]. Therefore, we expect a non trivial behaviour with a maximum of cooperation at some value $\tilde{p} \in (0, 1)$. Actually, as shown in Figure 2, in numerical simulations we see a relatively long plateau with a great level of cooperation around $p \sim 0.01$.

Such behaviour can be understood by means of topological considerations. As pointed out in Section 3, our network undergoes a sort of (smooth) transition at $p \sim p^* = 2k/L$. Indeed, for smaller values of p the system is topologically equivalent to a WS small-world network, whilst for larger values it behaves like an ER one. When we consider the system in Figure 2, we have $p^* \simeq 0.002$, and we correspondingly see a sudden increase of the final cooperation just around this value itself. Moreover, in the WS regime the number of short-cuts is not enough yet to affect appreciably the dynamics of the system (there is only a very slight increase of the final cooperators due to the effect described just above). However, when this number becomes large enough (more precisely, when the number of the sort-cuts is larger than that of regular links), the presence of several hubs connected with stable cooperators makes the configuration of the system very favorable to the final emergence of the cooperation. Finally, when p approaches 1, the number of short-cuts becomes so large that the system is practically a fully connected graph, hubs are no longer hubs but they are almost like any other node, and the cooperation is completely suppressed [17].

Similar effects happen for $k \geq 2$, but in that case everything is much more complicated. In any event, in the one dimensional case ($p = 0$) the dynamics is again purely deterministic (with the UI update rule), and the final frozen state depends only on the initial configuration of the system. Given the random initial conditions we are using, the cooperator density of the frozen state is around 0.96, for large enough system sizes. This means that, for an euclidean ring, increasing the coordination number enhances enormously the cooperation. This could be expected because, following the reasoning illustrated above, with 4 neighbours, a cooperator is likely to be imitated by a defector. For example, let us consider the border between two long clusters, each of opposite strategy (see Figure 7). Here, provided that $b \in (1, 3/2)$, the first defector is connected with a cooperator with larger payoff, so that she will flip at the next stage to the C strategy (whilst no cooperator is connected with an analogous better-fitting defector). Consequently, the cooperator cluster will increase its size in one unit at each time step, until a frozen state almost completely full of cooperators is reached. In case the dynamics was given by the REP rule, the result is the same, although the time scale needed to reach the asymptotic scale is much longer due to the probabilistic nature of the rule.

When short-cuts are added, we have again a different regime, depending on whether $p < p^*$ or $p > p^*$. In the first regime, there are less short-cuts than regular links,




Figure 7. Sample of elementary dynamics on the boundary between two long clusters of different strategy ($k = 2$); the numbers above the individuals (singled out by their strategy) are the payoffs earned after just that time step. With the UI microscopical update rule and $b \in (1, 3/2)$, the cooperating cluster gains one position at each elementary time step.

and hence the system is topologically like a WS small-world network with $k = 2$, *i.e.* globally it behaves like a random network (very low diameter) whilst locally it resembles a regular lattice (clustering coefficient almost constant around $\chi_0(2) = 1/2$, which decreases reaching a minimum only for $p \rightarrow p^*$). When a few short-cuts are present in the system, defection is initially enhanced for the same mechanism that promotes cooperation for $k = 1$: A short-cut could connect a cooperator with a defector with larger payoff, driving the first to change her strategy to defection. Finally, once that $p > p^*$, the system becomes equivalent to an ER random network and the cooperation is enhanced again, until for p large enough we end up with a complete graph where only defectors survive. As can be seen in Figure 5, for each value of L , and hence of $p^* = 2k/L$, the final level of cooperation decreases when $p \lesssim p^*$, then increases rapidly as soon as $p \gtrsim p^*$, before vanishing completely for $p \rightarrow 1^-$, confirming the interpretation given above.

It must be noticed that all the reasoning and considerations we have done in this section assume that the microscopical update rule is the unconditional imitation. We have also indicated along the way that choosing the REP rule will only change the time scale of the evolution. In addition, in so far as there is no possibility of mistakes, the general scheme proposed above also holds with mixed update rules (see Figures 4 and 6): Cooperation is mostly suppressed for $p \lesssim p^*$ (WS topology), greatly enhanced for $p \gtrsim p^*$ (ER topology), and totally suppressed for $p \rightarrow 1^-$ (fully connected graph topology).

6. Conclusions and perspectives

In this paper we have investigated how the topology of a system in which a population of many individuals interact by means of the PDG can influence the emergence of stable cooperative behaviours, focusing on the effect of short-cuts. For this purpose we exploited a simple model which can assume different topological features of different systems (euclidean lattice, WS small-world network, ER random network, and fully connected graph) by tuning only the value of a single parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ (the link-adding probability). In this way, it is easier to distinguish the precise role each particular topology plays in enhancing (or suppressing) cooperation. In particular, we have shown how a regular euclidean lattice promotes cooperation only for $k \geq 2$, k being the coordination number of a one-dimensional ring, while for $k = 1$ only a small minority of cooperators survives in the final frozen state. We have also seen that the WS topology does not enhance cooperation, whilst the ER network configuration is the best cooperation promoter of all in this family. Finally, as was already well known, in a fully connected graph (or, equivalently, in the mean-field approximation) only defectors can survive in the final state.

Since the only free parameter of the network model is the link-adding probability p and the results do not depend on the particular dynamics considered, it is the density of short-cuts actually existing in the system that must determine the ultimate fate of the dynamics. Indeed, when $0 < p \lesssim p^*$, the presence of short-cuts (whose number is still smaller than that of regular links) causes at most a perturbation of the configuration emerging in the euclidean case (the final level of cooperation is very slightly increased if $k = 1$, not dramatically decreased otherwise), while for $p \gtrsim p^*$ in the network many hubs appear, and a cooperator hub is very likely to act as a seed for the spreading of the cooperation throughout the whole system. By means of such a mechanism, the cooperation is enhanced much more than in the other topological regimes. Finally, when $p \rightarrow 1^-$, every site ends up being connected with all the others and the system becomes a fully connected graph, where only defectors can survive. Therefore, this picture suggests that the ER topology might be the best one in this family in order to promote cooperation, and that this property is quite robust, given that the same (qualitatively) behaviour can be found with different update rules (UI and REP dynamics), and also mixing them and letting them co-evolve in the same system. We want to stress that this mechanism for the promotion of cooperation has nothing to do with the one based on clustering discussed in [7, 18], as the clustering of the networks where we observe a plateau in the cooperation level is very small ($\sim p$). This is hence a novel mechanism that has not been discussed before and that confers to short-cuts a very important role in the emergence of cooperation. In fact, they can be used to eliminate the effect of topological traps discussed in [27], which arises due to the existence of bottlenecks and lack of redundant paths. The work summarized here shows that a not so large fraction of short-cuts can have dramatic effects on the final level of cooperation achieved in the population.

In summary, our work confirms the importance of the topology in the emergence of stable cooperative behaviors in a large system of agents playing the PDG, without reducing the importance of the update rule chosen, since in any case the UI update rule enhances cooperation always better than the REP one as is the case in degree-homogeneous networks. On the other hand, a more-in-depth study of the role of other update rules is still needed; in particular, in the present work we have neglected the family of rules allowing the agents to make some mistakes, *i.e.* allowing an agent to imitate a worse-fitting neighbour, as for instance happens with the Moran rule [18, 28]. The case of a two-dimensional initial lattice is also interesting, although we envisage that in that case it will be difficult, if not impossible, to gain insights from an analytical viewpoint as we have done here. Future works should deal with these issues using the results in this paper as starting point and guidance.

References

- [1] Darwin C., “The Descent of Man”, London (1871).
- [2] Axelrod R and Hamilton W. D., *Science*, **211**, 1390 (1981).
- [3] Maynard-Smith J. and Szathmáry E., “The Major Transitions in Evolution”, Oxford (1995).
- [4] Nowak M. A. and May R. M., *Nature*, **359**, 826 (1992).
- [5] Szabó G. and Fáth G., *Phys. Rep.*, **446**, 97 (2007).
- [6] Tomassini M., Luthi L. and Pestelacci E., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C* **18**, 1173 (2007).
- [7] Roca C. P., Cuesta J. A. and Sánchez A., *Phys. of Life Rev.*, **6**, 208 (2009).
- [8] Assenza S., Gómez-Gardeñes J. and Latora V., *Phys. Rev. E*, **78**, 017101 (2008).
- [9] Pusch A., Weber S. and Porto M., *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 036120 (2008).
- [10] Santos F. C. and Pacheco J. M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 098104 (2005).
- [11] Gómez-Gardeñes J., Campillo, M., Floría, L. M. and Moreno, Y., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98**, 108103 (2007).
- [12] Vilone D. and Castellano C., *Phys. Rev. E*, **69**, 016109 (2004).
- [13] Watts D. J. and Strogatz S. H., *Nature*, **393**, 440 (1998).
- [14] Rapoport A. and Chammah A. M., “Prisoner’s Dilemma”, The University of Michigan (1965).
- [15] Hofbauer J. and Sigmund K., “Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics”, Cambridge (1998).
- [16] Perc M. and Szolnoki A., *BioSystems*, **99**, 109 (2010).
- [17] Moyano L. G. and Sánchez A., *J. Theor. Biol.*, **259**, 84 (2009).
- [18] Roca C. P., Cuesta J. A. and Sánchez A., *Phys. Rev. E*, **80**, 046106 (2009).
- [19] Hauert C. and Doebeli M., *Nature*, **428**, 643 (2004).
- [20] Sysu-Aho M., Saramäki J., Kertész J. and Kaski K., *Eur. Phys. B*, **44**, 129 (2005).
- [21] Ohtsuki H. and Nowak M. A., *Proc. R. Soc.*, **273**, 2249 (2006).
- [22] Barrat A. and Weigt M., *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **13**, 547 (2000).
- [23] Erdős P. and Rényi A., “On Random Graphs I” in *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **6**, 290 (1959).
- [24] Roca C. P., Cuesta J. A. and Sánchez A., *Europhys. Lett.*, **87**, 48005 (2009).
- [25] Cardillo A., Gómez-Gardeñes J., Vilone D. and Sánchez A., *New J. Phys.*, in press (2010).
- [26] Eshel I., Samuelson L. and Shaked A., *Am. Econ. Rev.*, **88**, 1, 157 (1998).
- [27] Roca C. P., Lozano S., Arenas A., Sánchez A., submitted (2010).
- [28] Moran P. A. P., “The Statistical Processes of Evolutionary Theory”, Oxford (1962).

