

Evolution of Cooperation on Temporal Networks

Aming Li^{1,2,3}, Lei Zhou^{1,4}, Qi Su¹, Sean P. Cornelius^{2,5},
Yang-Yu Liu^{5,6,*}, and Long Wang^{1,*}

¹*Center for Systems and Control, College of Engineering,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

²*Center for Complex Network Research and Department of Physics,
Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA*

³*Department of Physics, Physics of Living Systems Group,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

⁴*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

⁵*Channing Division of Network Medicine,
Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School,
Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA*

⁶*Center for Cancer Systems Biology,
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA*

(Dated: September 27, 2016)

Abstract

The structure of social networks is a key determinant in fostering cooperation and other altruistic behavior among naturally selfish individuals. However, most real social interactions are temporal, being both finite in duration and spread out over time. This raises the question of whether stable cooperation can form despite an intrinsically fragmented social fabric. Here we develop a framework to study the evolution of cooperation on temporal networks in the setting of the classic Prisoner's Dilemma. By analyzing both real and synthetic datasets, we find that temporal networks generally facilitate the evolution of cooperation compared to their static counterparts. More interestingly, we find that the intrinsic human interactive pattern like bursty behavior impedes the evolution of cooperation. Finally, we introduce a measure to quantify the temporality present in networks and demonstrate that there is an intermediate level of temporality that boosts cooperation most. Our results open a new avenue for investigating the evolution of cooperation in more realistic structured populations.

* Corresponding authors.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding and sustaining the evolution of cooperation in human and animal societies have long been a challenge since Darwin [1–5]. Evolutionary game theory offers a prominent paradigm to explain the emergence and persistence of cooperation among egoists, and many results have been obtained from analytical calculations [4, 5], numerical simulations [5, 6], and behavioral experiments [7–14]. Traditionally, researchers have been focusing on the well-mixed or homogeneous population scenarios [2–4, 15]. Yet, both spatial population structures and social networks suggest that real populations are typically not well-mixed. Indeed, in a population some individuals may interact more likely than others do. In both theory and experiments, the ideally well-mixed scenario has been extended to heterogeneous structured populations represented by complex networks, where nodes represent individuals and links capture who interacts with whom [11, 13, 15–17]. And a unifying framework coined as network reciprocity is proposed for emergence of cooperation in structured populations [18], especially for the networks with the degree heterogeneity which is typically observed in scale-free networks [17, 19].

Despite their deep insights, those works all rely on a key assumption that the contact graph or the interaction network of individuals is time invariant. In reality, this assumption is often violated, especially in social networks, where contacts between individuals are typically short-lived. Emails and text messages for example represent near-instantaneous and hence ephemeral links in a network. Even in cases where the contacts have non-negligible durations — such as phone calls, or the face-to-face interactions between inpatients in the same hospital ward — their finite nature means that the network structure is in constant flux. It has been shown that the temporality of edge activations can noticeably affect various dynamical processes, ranging from the information or epidemics spreading [20–23] to network accessibility [24] to controllability [25].

It is natural to expect that temporality will have a similarly profound effect in social systems, particularly in situations when individuals engage in interactive behavior. Indeed, if Alice interacts with Bob who only later betrays Charlie, Alice’s behavior toward Bob could not have been influenced by his later treachery. Yet the links A—B—C would be ever-present in a static representation of this social network. Despite some existing efforts [26], up to our knowledge, the impact of temporal networks on the evolution of cooperation has not been systematically explored. It is still unclear whether the temporality will enhance the cooperation or not.

Here for the first time, we explore the impacts of temporality of human interactions on the evolution of cooperation over both empirical and synthetic networks. Moreover, the impacts of the bursty behavior rooted in human activity on the evolution of cooperation are also investigated.

II. MODEL

We conduct our investigation in the setting of classic evolutionary game theory, in which each of two players may choose a strategy of cooperation (C) or defection (D). Each receives a payoff R for mutual cooperation, and an amount P for mutual defection. When the players' strategies disagree, the defector receives a payoff T while the cooperator receives S . These outcomes can be neatly encoded in the payoff matrix

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{cc} C & D \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} C \\ D \end{array} & \begin{pmatrix} R & S \\ T & P \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

where the entries give the payoff each player receives under different combinations of strategy. For simplicity, we focus on the case where $R = 1, T = b$ and $S = P = 0$, leaving the sole parameter $b > 1$, which represents the temptation to defect and hence the system's tendency toward selfish behavior. This parameter choice corresponds to the classic Prisoner's Dilemma, wherein the optimal strategy for any single individual is to defect, while mutual cooperation is the best choice for the alliance [15, 17, 27, 28].

Figure 1 illustrates the essence of our framework. We consider a temporal network to be a sequence of separate networks on the same set of N nodes, which we call *snapshots*. These snapshots are constructed from empirical data by aggregating social contacts over successive windows of Δt (Fig. 1a and 1b), yielding the links active in that snapshot. To capture the interactions occurring on these networks, we initially set an equal fraction of cooperators and defectors (network nodes) in the population on the first snapshot. At the beginning of each generation (round of games), every individual i plays the above game with each of its k_i neighbors, accumulating a total payoff P_i according to the matrix above. At the end of each generation each player i may change his or her strategy, by randomly picking a neighbor j with payoff P_j from its k_i neighbors, and then imitating j 's strategy with probability $(P_j - P_i)/(Dk_d)$ if $P_j > P_i$. Here $D = T - S$ and k_d is the larger of k_i and k_j [17, 29]. We repeat this procedure g times within each snapshot before changing the network structure (Fig. 1c). In this way, g controls the timescale difference between the dynamics on the network and the dynamics of the network. We continue running the game, changing the network structure every g generations, until the system reaches a stable fraction of cooperators, f_c .

III. RESULTS

A. Temporal networks facilitate the evolution of cooperation

Our principal result is the temporal networks generally enhance cooperation relative to their static counterparts, and allow it to persist at higher levels of temptation b . Figure 2

shows the equilibrium fraction of cooperators f_c for temporal networks formed from empirical data of four social systems [30]: attendees at a scientific conference (ACM conference) [31], students at a high school in Marseilles, France in two different years (Student 2012 [32], Student 2013 [33]), and workers in an office building (Office 2013) [34]. In each of these systems there exists a broad range of g over which f_c is greater in the temporal network than in its static equivalent, at almost all values of b . This is true even for small Δt . Here the network’s links are distributed over a large number of rarefied snapshots, leaving little network “scaffolding” on which to build a stable cooperation. Nonetheless, there exists a range of g that can compensate for this sparsity, again leaving temporal networks the victor. Indeed, the only situation in which temporal networks are less amenable to cooperation than static networks is when g is small. In this limit, the evolutionary timescale is comparable to the dynamical timescale, and patterns of cooperation have no time to stabilize before being disrupted by the next change in network structure.

To test whether these results arise from the specific temporal patterns in real social systems, we have also simulated games on temporal versions of synthetic scale-free (SF) [35] and Erdős-Rényi (ER) [36] random networks (see Methods). We again find that with almost level of temporality (*i.e.*, $g < \infty$), cooperators have an easier time gaining footholds in the population (Fig. 3). Interestingly, the temporal scale free networks yield a higher f_c , all other things being equal, than the temporal ER networks (Fig. 3 and Fig. S1). As such, temporality preserves the cooperative advantage of heterogenous populations, previous observed in static networks [17].

B. Effects of burstiness on the evolution of cooperation

Analyses of the temporal patterns of human interactions in email [37], phone calls [37], and written correspondence [38] have revealed a high degree of burstiness — periods of intense activity followed by “lulls” of relative silence. Such correlations embedded in temporal interactions have been shown to have effects on network dynamics above and beyond those of temporality alone, for instance accelerating the spread of contagions [22, 39]. We have verified that burstiness is present to varying degrees in the four data sets we study, in the form of a power law distribution of inter-event times between the node activations (Fig. S2). But to what extent do these patterns help or hinder the evolution of cooperation?

We have studied this question by randomizing the contacts in each of the datasets we study, both their source and target (i, j) and their timestamps t . We stress that this randomization has the effect of erasing bursty behavior at the level of individual node. In every temporal network, we find that cooperation is improved when the natural burstiness is removed in this way, suggesting that bursty behavior impedes the evolution of cooperation (Fig. 4). For the effects of other null models that permute only the structure or the time stamps of the contacts, please refer to Figs. S3 to S6, where we also show that the above

results are robust after the data is randomized with various methods. Furthermore, this is true for nearly all choices of parameters Δt , g , and b . But how do we make sense of these findings in relation to the observation above, namely that real temporal networks generically promote cooperation?

C. Temporality determines the fate of cooperators

The parameters g and Δt , and the burstiness represent three different facets of temporality. Specifically, the relationship between the dynamical/structural timescales, the amount the network structure is spread over time, and the correlations between the associated snapshots, respectively. To understand the effects of these parameters in a unified way, we introduce the following measure of the *temporality* \mathcal{T} of a temporal network with M snapshots as

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \frac{\sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}(m) - a_{ij}(m+1)|}{\sum_{i,j} \max\{a_{ij}(m), a_{ij}(m+1)\}}.$$

Here $a_{ij}(m)$ is the connectivity between nodes i and j in snapshot m , being 1 if the nodes have a contact in the associated time window and 0 otherwise, and the above fraction equals to 0 for any two nearby empty networks without links. This measure captures the likelihood that any currently inactive link will become active in the next snapshot (or conversely, that an active link becomes inactive). If we need to replay the temporal network M is $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil$, and $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil - 1$ if we do not. For a temporal network, generally $0 < \mathcal{T} \leq 1$, and $\mathcal{T} = 0$ for static network where network topology does not change with time.

Figure 5 shows the value of \mathcal{T} computed for the original and randomized versions of each of the four data sets we study. We see that the original data displays high temporality, which decreases following the randomization procedure (RPTRE) described above. Considering that f_c for the randomized temporal networks is typically higher than in the originals (Fig. 4), this suggests that too high temporality is inimical to the spread of cooperation, instead fostering egoistic behavior. On the other hand, too low of a \mathcal{T} is also associated with diminished cooperation. For example, f_c is not maximal in Fig. 2 for $\Delta t = 24$, which corresponds to snapshots that are relatively dense and slowly changing, paving the way for defectors to extort cooperators. Altogether, the picture that emerges is one of an intermediate regime — a “sweet spot” of temporality in which cooperation is enhanced relative to static systems.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Considering the real characteristics of human interactions where the underlying networks are temporal and possess the underlying interactive patterns, we have addressed the evolution of cooperation on temporal networks. After finding that temporal networks from

empirical datasets favor the evolution of cooperation more than their static counterparts, we also validate our results on synthetic networks. This central finding holds even after the empirical data is randomized, thereby destroying specific temporal patterns (such as bursts) characterizing real human interactions. Altogether, this suggests that temporality — and temporality alone — is sufficient to improve cooperation. Interestingly, after randomizations, we find that the level of cooperation is further improved suggesting that the bursty nature of human interactions hinders the maintenance of cooperation to some degree. At last, we demonstrate that the temporality of a temporal network determines the fate of cooperators, with cooperators flourishing at intermediate values of the network temporality. By virtue of both empirical and traditional synthetic data, our explorations systematically illustrate the effects of temporality on the evolution of cooperation.

Note that the intrinsic temporal nature of the contact graph or interaction network is fundamentally different from the slight change of population structure due to individuals' migration [40–42]. The latter is usually restricted to the elaborate rules or strategies based on a presumed synthetic static network [27, 29, 40–48]. The coevolution of the network and strategy has been studied in the case where the network changes passively and with small temporality under constant average degree and population size [49–54]. These coevolutionary dynamics arise from players' strategic switch of partners, a process typically governed by pre-determined mechanisms. However, it is unlikely that the natural temporality observed in real human social dynamics is driven exclusively (or even primarily) by strategic switching in pursuit of a given objective.

Another natural extension of the current work on temporal networks is to consider the group interactions, which involve the interactions between individuals who are not directly connected with one another [55–58]. These interactions generate much more dynamical complexity, which cannot be captured by pairwise interactions [59, 60]. This is also true in microbial populations, where even pairwise outcomes could predict the survival of three-species competitions with high accuracy, yet information from the outcomes of three-species competitions is still needed as we want to predict the scenario over more number of species [61]. Moreover, the menu of strategies can be expanded beyond the simple dichotomy of cooperation versus defection. For example, the canonical three strategies game rock-paper-scissors, which may serve as a model to study the biological diversity in microbial populations and communities [62–64].

Finally, our results have implications for other dynamical processes occurring on temporal networks. If we regard the evolution of cooperation on temporal networks as a spreading dynamics of different strategies, it may serve as a new angle to investigate other related dynamics. For example, consider epidemic spreading, where the temporal network characteristics of networks had been shown to either speed up [22, 65] or slow down [37, 66] the spreading, and the shuffle of time stamps was shown to enhance the spreading in a network of sex buyers and prostitutes [39]. After evaluating the payoffs (benefits and costs) of susceptible and infected individuals as they encounter one another, our framework of the

evolution of cooperation may help us understand more phenomena including the epidemic spreading on temporal networks.

METHODS

Empirical temporal networks. We construct temporal networks from empirical datasets [30] by aggregating contacts into undirected network links over time windows of Δt (Fig. 1a). Here, a contact is a triplet (t, i, j) representing the fact that individuals i and j interacted during the time interval $(t, t + 20s]$. In this way, we obtain a temporal network with $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil$ snapshots, where T is the total time span of the dataset and $\lceil z \rceil$ is the smallest integer greater than or equal to z . Thus the active time interval for the snapshot m is from $(m - 1)\Delta t$ to $m\Delta t$, and a link between i and j exists if players i and j interact at least once in that time period (Fig. 1b). We obtain a static network in the limit where $\Delta t = T$.

Synthetic temporal networks. We generate temporal versions of scale-free and random networks with size N and average degree $\langle k \rangle$ by first generating a base static network, using static model [67] and the Erdős-Rényi model [36], respectively. We then form M snapshots by randomly and independently choosing a fraction p of edges to be active in each one. We have verified that our results hold under more sophisticated methods for building temporal networks from a static network backbone, such as the activity-drive model [68]

Randomizations of empirical datasets. We consider four widely-used null models [69] to randomize the empirical data: Randomized Edges (RE) where we randomly choose pairs of edges (i, j) and (i', j') , and replace them with (i, i') and (j, j') or (i, j') and (j, i') with equal probability provided this results in no self loops; Randomly Permuted Times (RPT), where we shuffle the timestamps of the contacts, leaving their sources and targets unaltered; Randomly Permuted Times + Randomized Edges (RPTRE) which consists first of RPT followed by RE; and Time Reversal (TR), where the temporal order of the contacts is reversed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A.L., L.Z., Q.S. and L.W. are supported by NSFC (Grants No. 61375120 and No. 61533001). A.L. and L.Z. also acknowledge the support from China Scholarship Council (CSC) with No. 201406010195 and No. 201606010270, respectively. S.P.C. is supported by the John Templeton Foundation (No. 51977) and NIH (No. P50HG004233). Y.-Y.L. is supported by the John Templeton Foundation: Mathematical and Physical Sciences grant number PFI-777.

TABLE I. **Statistics of the datasets.** The four datasets we employed are interactions between: attendees of a ACM Hypertext conference over about 2.5 days from 8am on Jun. 29th 2009 (ACM conference), students in 5 classes at a high school in Marseilles, France over a period of 7 days in Nov. 2012 (Student 2012), in 9 classes at a high school in Marseilles, France over 5 days in Dec. 2013 (Student 2013), individuals in an office building in France, from Jun. 24 to Jul. 3, 2013 (Office 2013). The number of snapshots is calculated based on the total time window T over which the data were collected, and Δt (in seconds) is the time window used to aggregate the contacts into snapshots. Contacts are defined as individual triples (t, i, j) in the data, meaning nodes i and j were observed interacting in the time interval $(t, t + 20s]$. Events (links), on the other hand, are continuous interactions formed by coalescing time-adjacent contacts between the same i and j .

	ACM conference	Student 2012	Student 2013	Office 2013
Number of nodes	113	180	327	92
Number of snapshots	$\lceil 212,360s/\Delta t \rceil$	$\lceil 729,520s/\Delta t \rceil$	$\lceil 363,580s/\Delta t \rceil$	$\lceil 987,640s/\Delta t \rceil$
Number of contacts	20,808	45,047	188,508	9,827
Number of events (links)	9,865	19,774	67,613	4,592
Recording period (day)	2.5	7	5	14
Time resolution (second)	20	20	20	20




FIG. 1. **Construction of temporal networks from temporal interactions, and evolutionary process on temporal networks.** (a) Temporal interactions between 8 individuals indicated by solid circles with different colors. Along the whole time from $t = 1$ to $t = T$, each individual is depicted by the same color line, over which the corresponding circles will be given and connected with each other at time t provided two players interact with each other during the time interval $(t - \tau, t]$. Here $\tau = 1$ for the simplicity of visualizations, and normally in the real data collected by SocioPatterns [30], $\tau = 20$ s. (b) Four different temporal networks that arise from aggregating the interactions shown in (a) into snapshots using different time windows Δt . When $\Delta t = T$, all interactions are captured in a single snapshot, corresponding to the static network that is the typical object of study in social network data. In general, when $\Delta t < T$, we have $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil$ snapshots. (c) The definition of evolutionary process on temporal networks. Taking the temporal network corresponding to $\Delta t = 4$ in (b) as an example, we perform g generations of evolution in each snapshot before changing the network structure to the next one, and totally we run G generations until the composition of the population is stable. If $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil * g < G$, we repeat the sequence of snapshots from the beginning until convergence.




FIG. 2. **Temporal networks generally promote the evolution of cooperation in real social systems.** For four empirical datasets: (a) the ACM conference, (b) Student 2012, (c) Student 2013, and (d) Office 2013, we show the stable frequency of cooperation on both temporal (colored lines) and static (black dashed lines) networks with different values of the aggregation time windows Δt . We choose 1, 2, 6, 24 hours from left to right in (a) to (c) and 6, 8, 12, 24 hours in (d), respectively. After letting the population evolve g generations on each snapshot, we average over another 2,000 generations after $G = 10^6$ generations on each temporal network, to obtain the stable frequency of cooperators. The statistics of each dataset are given in Table I.




FIG. 3. **Evolution of cooperation on temporal networks generated from synthetic data.** Here we generate M sparse snapshots based on a base scale-free network formed from static model [67], and a base Erdős-Rényi random [36] network, choosing a fraction p of edges to be active within each snapshot. Here $M = 100$, the network size $N = 1000$, and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 10$. The robustness of the corresponding results for other parameters and other methods of generating synthetic temporal networks has been verified (see Fig. S1 in the SI).




FIG. 4. **The intrinsic bursty behavior in human interactions suppresses the maintenance of cooperation.** For each dataset, we show the difference $f_c^{\text{RPTRE}} - f_c^{\text{ORI}}$ between the stable frequency of cooperators f_c^{RPTRE} in temporal networks generated from each dataset after randomly permuting both the timestamps and edges (RPTRE in the Methods) which erases the burstiness inherent to human interaction data (see Methods), and f_c^{ORI} over the original scenarios. We see that the frequency of cooperators generally increases after the bursty behavior is destroyed, suggesting that correlations in activity within a social network is antagonistic toward the formation of cooperation. Results on each dataset after randomizations with different null models [69] are given in Figs. S3 to S6 in the SI. Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. 5. **The temporality of real networks.** The temporality \mathcal{T} of the original datasets is shown alongside their randomizations for different time windows Δt . We find that by destroying burstiness, randomizations altering the time ordering of contacts (RPT, RPTRE) decrease \mathcal{T} . Figure S7 shows how the overall temporality \mathcal{T} changes on a snapshot-by-snapshot basis, and the corresponding standard deviation is given in this figure.

-
- [1] Hamilton, W. D. The evolution of altruistic behavior. *Am. Nat.* **97**, pp. 354–356 (1963).
 - [2] Trivers, R. L. The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **46**, 35–57 (1971).
 - [3] Maynard Smith, J. Group selection. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **51**, 277 – 283 (1976).
 - [4] Hofbauer, J. & Sigmund, K. *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
 - [5] Nowak, M. A. *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006).
 - [6] Szabó, G. & Fáth, G. Evolutionary games on graphs. *Phys. Rep.* **446**, 97–216 (2007).
 - [7] Traulsen, A., Semmann, D., Sommerfeld, R. D., Krambeck, H.-J. & Milinski, M. Human strategy updating in evolutionary games. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**, 2962–2966 (2010).

- [8] Grujić, J., Fosco, C., Araujo, L., Cuesta, J. A. & Sánchez, A. Social Experiments in the Mesoscale: Humans Playing a Spatial Prisoner’s Dilemma. *PLoS ONE* **5**, e13749 (2010).
- [9] Suri, S. & Watts, D. J. Cooperation and Contagion in Web-Based, Networked Public Goods Experiments. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e16836 (2011).
- [10] Rand, D. G., Arbesman, S. & Christakis, N. A. Dynamic social networks promote cooperation in experiments with humans. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 19193–19198 (2011).
- [11] Gracia-Lázaro, C. *et al.* Heterogeneous networks do not promote cooperation when humans play a Prisoner’s Dilemma. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, 12922–12926 (2012).
- [12] Wang, J., Suri, S. & Watts, D. J. Cooperation and assortativity with dynamic partner updating. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, 14363–14368 (2012).
- [13] Rand, D. G., Nowak, M. A., Fowler, J. H. & Christakis, N. A. Static network structure can stabilize human cooperation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 17093–17098 (2014).
- [14] Antonioni, A., Tomassini, M. & Sánchez, A. Short-Range Mobility and the Evolution of Cooperation: An Experimental Study. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 10282 (2015).
- [15] Nowak, M. A. & May, R. M. Evolutionary games and spatial chaos. *Nature* **359**, 826–829 (1992).
- [16] Lieberman, E., Hauert, C. & Nowak, M. A. Evolutionary dynamics on graphs. *Nature* **433**, 312–316 (2005).
- [17] Santos, F. C. & Pacheco, J. M. Scale-free networks provide a unifying framework for the emergence of cooperation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 098104 (2005).
- [18] Nowak, M. A. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science* **314**, 1560–1563 (2006).
- [19] Santos, F. C., Pacheco, J. M. & Lenaerts, T. Evolutionary dynamics of social dilemmas in structured heterogeneous populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **103**, 3490–3494 (2006).
- [20] Masuda, N., Klemm, K. & Eguíluz, V. M. Temporal networks: Slowing down diffusion by long lasting interactions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 188701 (2013).
- [21] Scholtes, I. *et al.* Causality-driven slow-down and speed-up of diffusion in non-Markovian temporal networks. *Nature Commun.* **5**, 5024 (2014).
- [22] Takaguchi, T., Masuda, N. & Holme, P. Bursty communication patterns facilitate spreading in a threshold-based epidemic dynamics. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e68629 (2013).
- [23] Starnini, M., Baronchelli, A., Barrat, A. & Pastor-Satorras, R. Random walks on temporal networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 056115 (2012).
- [24] Lentz, H. H. K., Selhorst, T. & Sokolov, I. M. Unfolding accessibility provides a macroscopic approach to temporal networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 118701 (2013).
- [25] Li, A., Cornelius, S. P., Liu, Y.-Y., Wang, L. & Barabási, A.-L. The fundamental advantages of temporal networks. *arXiv* 1607.06168v1 (2016).
- [26] Cardillo, A. *et al.* Evolutionary dynamics of time-resolved social interactions. *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 1–11 (2014).

- [27] Vainstein, M. H., Silva, A. T. C. & Arenzon, J. J. Does mobility decrease cooperation? *J. Theor. Bio.* **244**, 722–728 (2007).
- [28] Gómez-Gardeñes, J., Campillo, M., Floría, L. M. & Moreno, Y. Dynamical organization of cooperation in complex topologies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 1–4 (2007).
- [29] Meloni, S. *et al.* Effects of mobility in a population of prisoner’s dilemma players. *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 067101 (2009).
- [30] <http://www.sociopatterns.org>.
- [31] Isella, L. *et al.* What’s in a crowd? analysis of face-to-face behavioral networks. *J. Theor. Bio.* **271**, 166 – 180 (2011).
- [32] Fournet, J. & Barrat, A. Contact patterns among high school students. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e107878 (2014).
- [33] Mastrandrea, R., Fournet, J. & Barrat, A. Contact patterns in a high school: A comparison between data collected using wearable sensors, contact diaries and friendship surveys. *PLoS ONE* **10**, 1–26 (2015).
- [34] Genois, M. *et al.* Data on face-to-face contacts in an office building suggest a low-cost vaccination strategy based on community linkers. *Netw. Sci.* **3**, 326–347 (2015).
- [35] Barabási, A.-L. & Albert, R. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* **286**, 509–512 (1999).
- [36] Erdős, P. & Rényi, A. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* **5**, 17–60 (1960).
- [37] Karsai, M. *et al.* Small but slow world: How network topology and burstiness slow down spreading. *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 025102 (2011).
- [38] Barabási, A.-L. The origin of bursts and heavy tails in human dynamics. *Nature* **435**, 207–211 (2005).
- [39] Rocha, L. E. C., Liljeros, F. & Holme, P. Simulated epidemics in an empirical spatiotemporal network of 50,185 sexual contacts. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **7**, e1001109 (2011).
- [40] Helbing, D. & Yu, W. The outbreak of cooperation among success-driven individuals under noisy conditions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 3680–3685 (2009).
- [41] Roca, C. P. & Helbing, D. Emergence of social cohesion in a model society of greedy, mobile individuals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 11370–11374 (2011).
- [42] Li, A., Wu, T., Cong, R. & Wang, L. One step memory of group reputation is optimal to promote cooperation in public goods games. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **103**, 30007 (2013).
- [43] Aktipis, C. A. Know when to walk away: contingent movement and the evolution of cooperation. *J. Theor. Bio.* **231**, 249–260 (2004).
- [44] Wu, B. *et al.* Evolution of cooperation on stochastic dynamical networks. *PLoS ONE* **5**, e11187 (2010).
- [45] Wu, T., Fu, F., Zhang, Y. & Wang, L. Expectation-driven migration promotes cooperation by group interactions. *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 066104 (2012).

- [46] Antonioni, A., Tomassini, M. & Buesser, P. Random diffusion and cooperation in continuous two-dimensional space. *J. Theor. Bio.* **344**, 40–48 (2014).
- [47] Tomassini, M. & Antonioni, A. Lévy flights and cooperation among mobile individuals. *J. Theor. Bio.* **364**, 154–161 (2015).
- [48] Pinheiro, F. L., Santos, F. C. & Pacheco, J. M. Linking Individual and Collective Behavior in Adaptive Social Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 128702 (2016).
- [49] Skyrms, B. & Pemantle, R. A dynamic model of social network formation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **97**, 9340–9346 (2000).
- [50] Zimmermann, M. G., Eguíluz, V. M. & Miguel, M. S. Coevolution of dynamical states and interactions in dynamic networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 3–6 (2004).
- [51] Santos, F. C., Pacheco, J. M. & Lenaerts, T. Cooperation Prevails When Individuals Adjust Their Social Ties. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **2**, e140 (2006).
- [52] Szolnoki, A., Perc, M. & Danku, Z. Making new connections towards cooperation in the prisoner’s dilemma game. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **84**, 50007 (2008).
- [53] Fu, F., Hauert, C., Nowak, M. A. & Wang, L. Reputation-based partner choice promotes cooperation in social networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 026117 (2008).
- [54] Perc, M. & Szolnoki, A. Coevolutionary games - a mini review. *BioSystems* **99**, 109–125 (2010).
- [55] Santos, F. C., Santos, M. D. & Pacheco, J. M. Social diversity promotes the emergence of cooperation in public goods games. *Nature* **454**, 213–216 (2008).
- [56] Szolnoki, A., Perc, M. c. v. & Szabó, G. Topology-independent impact of noise on cooperation in spatial public goods games. *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 056109 (2009).
- [57] Li, A., Broom, M., Du, J. & Wang, L. Evolutionary dynamics of general group interactions in structured populations. *Phys. Rev. E* **93**, 022407 (2016).
- [58] Zhou, L., Li, A. & Wang, L. Evolution of cooperation on complex networks with synergistic and discounted group interactions. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **110**, 60006 (2015).
- [59] Gokhale, C. & Traulsen, A. Evolutionary games in the multiverse. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**, 5500–5504 (2010).
- [60] Li, A. & Wang, L. Evolutionary dynamics of synergistic and discounted group interactions in structured populations. *J. Theor. Bio.* **377**, 57 – 65 (2015).
- [61] Friedman, J., Higgins, L. M. & Gore, J. Community structure follows simple assembly rules in microbial microcosms. *bioRxiv* (2016).
- [62] Sinervo, B. & Lively, C. M. The rock-paper-scissors game and the evolution of alternative male strategies. *Nature* **380**, 240–243 (1996).
- [63] Durrett, R. & Levin, S. Allelopathy in spatially distributed populations. *J. Theor. Bio.* **185**, 165 – 171 (1997).
- [64] Kerr, B., Riley, M. A., Feldman, M. W. & Bohannan, B. J. M. Local dispersal promotes biodiversity in a real-life game of rock-paper-scissors. *Nature* **418**, 171–174 (2002).

- [65] Pan, R. K. & Saramäki, J. Path lengths, correlations, and centrality in temporal networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 016105 (2011).
- [66] Miritello, G., Moro, E. & Lara, R. Dynamical strength of social ties in information spreading. *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 045102 (2011).
- [67] Goh, K. I., Kahng, B. & Kim, D. Universal behavior of load distribution in scale-free networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 278701 (2001).
- [68] Perra, N., Gonçalves, B., Pastor-Satorras, R. & Vespignani, A. Activity driven modeling of time varying networks. *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 469 (2012).
- [69] Holme, P. & Saramäki, J. Temporal networks. *Phys. Rep.* **519**, 97–125 (2012).
- [70] Clauset, A., Shalizi, C. R. & Newman, M. E. J. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM Review* **51**, 661–703 (2009).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (SI)




FIG. S1. **Evolution of cooperation on synthetic temporal networks.** Here we generate M sparse snapshots based on M different scale-free networks with preferential attachment [35] and Erdős-Rényi random networks [36] with the network size $N = 1000$ and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 4$ (see Methods). Our results shown in Fig. 3 are also validated with different p , which determines the level of link activity of each snapshot. Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 3.




FIG. S2. **Bursty behavior in four datasets.** For every dataset, we obtain a number of inter-event time τ for each individual based on his or her interactive logs. For an individual, as the number is bigger than 30, we fit all τ with power-law distribution $P(\tau) \sim \tau^{-\gamma}$, generating a γ and an adjusted R^2 [70]. For each dataset, we give the distributions of γ and the adjusted R^2 for all individuals there. The second row shows that there are intrinsic bursty behavior in every original dataset.




FIG. S3. **Evolution of cooperation on temporal networks generated from the original and randomized ACM conference dataset.** For different null models, we show the stable fraction of cooperators f_c as a function of the dilemma parameter b for different g . RE and TR have no effect on the correlations in temporal activity by construction, and hence have no effects on network temporality apparently. RPT and RPTRE, on the other hand, destroy the temporal correlations between edges, thereby lowering the (too high) temporality of the system. Actually for the temporal network where we run g generation on each snapshot, the temporality of the underlying population structure is about \mathcal{T}/g . Thus for small g under RPT and RPTRE, f_c is increased markedly relative to the original dataset, while for large g the gains are more modest. The above findings are also true for other datasets (see Figs. S4 to S6). Overall, our results showing that temporal networks could facilitate the evolution of cooperation are robust even after the data is randomized. Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. S4. **Evolution of cooperation on temporal networks generated from the original and randomized Student 2012 dataset.** Note that when Δt is small, Randomized Edges (RE) has the effect of breaking up the network structure within the (already sparse) snapshots, inhibiting cooperation. Likewise, when g is big, RPT fails to improve f_c either owing to the small resulting temporality. All parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. S5. Evolution of cooperation on temporal networks generated from the original and randomized Student 2013 dataset. All parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. S6. Evolution of cooperation on temporal networks generated from the original and randomized Office 2013 dataset. All parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. S7. **How temporality arises from differences between successive snapshots.** Each time point shows the contribution to the temporality as defined in the main text made by each pair of snapshots m and $m + 1$. The total temporality \mathcal{T} is the average of these contributions. Randomization methods that destroy temporal correlations in nodal activity (RPT, RPTRE) have the effect of lowering this average. For every curve, we normalize the index of each snapshot under different Δt by dividing the corresponding $\lceil T/\Delta t \rceil$.